

JPRS-TAC-85-037

8 October 1985

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

8 October 1985

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

### ARMS CONTROL

#### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SDI Said 'Key Issue' in U.S.-Soviet Relations (Yuriy Zhukov; Moscow PRAVDA, 8 Sep 85) .....	1
France's Fabius on Space Arms at IHEDN (Laurent Fabius; Paris Diplomatic Information Service, 20 Sep 85) .....	6
Norwegian Labor Party Organ Attacks Government's SDI Stand (Editorial; Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET, 26 Jul 85) .....	13
Divisions in Norway's Ruling Coalition Over SDI Role (Editorial; Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET, 7 Sep 85) .....	15
Spanish Committee To Study 'Star Wars' Participation (Madrid ABC, 10 Sep 85) .....	16
Greek Spokesman Clarifies Papoulias 'Star Wars' Remark (Athens ATHENS NEWS, 12 Sep 85) .....	17
Italian CP Natta at L'UNITA Festival on U.S. ASAT Test (Rocco Di Biasi; Milan L'UNITA, 16 Sep 85) .....	18
Briefs	
FRG Experts at 'Star War' Talks	19
France Reiterates Eureka Importance	19

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC Commentary on Summit, Geneva Talks (Ren Wenhui; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, 16 Sep 85) .....	20
XINHUA Reports Gromyko's Condemnation of U.S. Stance (Beijing XINHUA, 24 Sep 85) .....	22

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Netherlands Labor Party on Cruise Missile Deployment (Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 19 Aug 85) .....	23
Dutch Influence on U.S. Missile Launchings Viewed as Minimal (Jan Gerritsen; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 18 Sep 85) ....	24

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA Editorial Article on U.S. Binary Weapons (Moscow PRAVDA, 9 Sep 85) .....	26
TASS Calls U.S. Chemical Weapons 'Special Threat' to Europe (Moscow TASS, 11 Sep 85) .....	30

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

New Zealand's Lange Tables Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty (Wellington THE EVENING POST, 11 Sep 85) .....	31
New Zealand Prime Minister on Respect for U.S. Position (Wellington THE EVENING POST, 11 Sep 85) .....	32
New Zealand Leader on Palmer's Meetings in U.S. (Hong Kong AFP, 23 Sep 85) .....	34
New Zealand Parliament Debates Antinuclear Bill (Debra Sturm; Wellington THE EVENING POST, 19 Sep 85) ....	35

## NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS: Australia Sees Mitterrand Mururoa Visit as 'Provocative' (Moscow TASS, 12 Sep 85) .....	37
Foreign Minister Cited	37
New Zealand's Lange Comments	37

## GENERAL

USER's Shevardnadze Addresses UN General Assembly (Moscow TASS, 24 Sep 85) .....	38
USSR: Criticism of Reagan September Press Conference (Moscow TASS, 26 Sep 85; Moscow in English to North America, 23 Sep 85) .....	46
Arms Imbalance 'Myths'	46
'Propagandistic Rivalry'	47



USSR: Commentaries on Upcoming Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Various sources, various dates) .....	49
U.S. Behavior 'Negative', by Boris Kalyagin	49
Western Public Opinion, by Yuriy Zhukov	50
'Common Efforts' Needed, by Vladlen Kuznetsov	55
Moscow Weekly Talk Show Focuses on Arms Issues (Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov; Moscow Domestic Service, 22 Sep 85) .....	58
UN General Assembly	58
Space Weapons	59
Nuclear Test Ban	60
Chemical Weapons	61
Reagan-Gorbachev Summit	64
Space, Nuclear Weapons Talks	64
U.S. 'Bluff'	64

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### SDI SAID 'KEY ISSUE' IN U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

PM081730 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

["International Review" by Yuriy Zhukov]

[Text] This week the attention of the world public has centered on the Soviet Union's new efforts aimed at reducing the tension in international relations, halting the arms race, and in this connection improving Soviet-American relations, which are an exceptionally important factor of world politics.

Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine published last Monday and his remarks during a conversation with a group of U.S. senators headed by R. Byrd, leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate, demonstrated anew the USSR's bold, principled, and genuinely constructive approach to the solution of these problems.

#### Authoritative Command of the Time

The Soviet Union has constantly advocated and advocates now the normalization of relations with all capitalist states, the United States included, on the basis of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence. This political course was again underlined with great cogency by the April Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, at which it was clearly stated:

"Our readiness to also improve relations with the United States to mutual benefit and without attempting to infringe each other's legitimate rights and interests is known. There is no fatal inevitability of the two countries confrontation. If we interpret both the positive and negative experience accumulated by the history of Soviet-American relations, both the recent and more remote history, then it must be said that the most reasonable thing is the quest for ways leading to smoothing out relations, and building a bridge of cooperation -- but one built from both sides."

Proceeding from this fundamental aim, the USSR is indeed currently waging its persistent struggle to return Soviet-American relations to the channel of normal, correct, mutually advantageous cooperation.

It was precisely this desire that dictated the USSR's decision to begin new talks with the United States in Geneva in March of this year on the basis of the understanding reached with the United States regarding the subject and aim of these talks, an understanding which, to put it briefly, looked like this: Not to begin an arms race in space, to halt the arms race on Earth, and to set about the radical reduction of nuclear armaments with a view to their ultimate complete liquidation.

It was precisely this desire that also dictated the Soviet Union's purposeful efforts to correct [vypravleniya] our bilateral relations with the United States and to impart to them a more stable and constructive nature. It was for the sake of this that the important accord was reached on holding the Soviet-American summit meeting scheduled for November in Geneva.

Nevertheless, the relations between our countries continue to deteriorate, the arms race is intensifying, and the threat of war remains. This arouses in the peoples of the entire world, including the people of the United States, constant anxiety and -- even more so -- alarm. This also found expression in the nature of the questions that the TIME magazine editors asked M.S. Gorbachev.

Nor did the group of U.S. senators that requested the meeting with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee conceal their own anxiety. The head of the group, Senate Democratic Party leader R. Byrd, stated in an interview last Sunday for U.S. television: "We must not treat each other as if we belong to different planets. We must hold talks with each other." And again he said: "We want the forthcoming summit meeting and the talks under way in Geneva to bring results."

Republican Party Senator J. Warner expressed himself in that same spirit.

M.S. Gorbachev's clear and precise, frank and sincere replies to TIME magazine and his remarks during the conversation with the U.S. senators have been greeted throughout the world as convincing proof of the unconquerable resolve of the Soviet Union, which is engaged in the implementation of majestic plans for its own development, to ensure peace, to break out of the vicious circle of the arms race, to find the solution to complex international problems, and to normalize relations with the United States despite the unconstructive policy which its leadership continues to pursue.

"M.S. Gorbachev views the forthcoming summit as a means with whose help we really can make progress and achieve a sharp improvement in relations between the two countries, and I am replying on this," U.S. Senator S. Nunn declared on his return from Moscow. And this senator subsequently expressed the hope that this meeting will be devoted to a quest for ways to make the world a safer place.

"An enormous fund of constructiveness" is contained in the Soviet leader's replies to TIME magazine -- this was said in a statement issued by the Board of the Social Democratic Party (FRG). The Social Democrats welcome such an approach to the development of relations with the United States.

"M.S. Gorbachev's replies are convincing confirmation of the fact that a firm, business-like, constructive approach to the issues perturbing the world is characteristic of the Soviet Union," the well-known British trade union figure (K. Kameron) emphasized.

Such responses are now emanating from literally every corner of the planet. The Soviet leadership's firm, calm, and constructive position in the face of unceasing attempts by senior officials [otvetstvennyye litsa] of the U.S. Administration to further intensify tension in anticipation of the forthcoming summit is meeting with understanding everywhere, including among prominent U.S. politicians, not to mention West Europe.

There is everywhere a broadening realization of the need to change the approach to relations with the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries, to abandon the dangerous and hopeless course toward confrontation, and to engage in a quest for approaches to businesslike and mutually advantageous cooperation.

People see in this the command of the time. For even President R. Reagan has acknowledged that nuclear war is impermissible and that there will be no victors in it. But if this is so, then why the policy of a nuclear and space arms race so stubbornly pursued by him, and why the so stubborn refusal to concur with any Soviet initiative aimed at ending this race?

#### At Variance With Logic

As was remarked in the replies to TIME magazine, so far Washington has been giving a negative response to any Soviet initiative: "No! No! No! Propaganda! Propaganda! Propaganda!" And this is followed by a display of "muscle flexing": The USSR announced a moratorium on underground nuclear explosions -- and the United States immediately and demonstratively replied by carrying out a new underground nuclear test. At the United Nations, the USSR introduced a proposal on peaceful cooperation in space in conditions of the nonmilitarization of space -- and the United States immediately and in that same demonstrative spirit announced the upcoming operational test of an antisatellite weapon, and at the same time began new tests of its MX strategic missile.

And there and then R. McFarlane, the President's national security assistant, came out with an arrogant statement from which it is clear that, in the opinion of the American side, the slightest success of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting will depend solely...on concessions by the USSR.

We do not yet know whether such an approach represents the determining factor in the American side's preparation for this meeting. Reports appear in the U.S. press from time to time claiming that there is no agreement within the U.S. Government on the question of just which position must be adopted in respect to the USSR's peace initiatives.

"It seems to me," W. Hyland, editor of the well-informed journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS, stated on television, for example, "that there exists in this administration an extraordinary division on the issue of how to act with regard to the Soviet Union. I suspect that certain administration representatives just don't want this meeting to take place at all. They believe that this is dangerous ground, that the President may fall into a trap (?) and so on..."

But THE WASHINGTON POST, a paper no less familiar with the machinery of government in the United States, adheres to a somewhat different opinion about just who is acting with caution with regard to the constructive holding of the summit. In an article published 5 September, it characterized as follows the position of the American leadership:

"Reagan is letting it be understood by his fellow citizens that they must not expect too much from this meeting. The President is trying to convince them that it would be unpatriotic (?) to expect any sort of agreement in the sphere of arms control at this meeting which has been postponed for so long. The vague statements about general discussions which have been heard from Santa Barbara (the President's California estate -- Yu.Zh) testify to the fact that the President intends to lecture (!) Moscow and not negotiate with it."

Is it not clear, however, that such an approach to the matter, if it really does exist in Washington, leads only to deadlock?

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, then -- as was stated in the replies to TIME magazine -- it believes that whenever we are talking about the leaders of powers such



as the United States and the USSR, their analysis of the situation and their practical policies must be imbued with a feeling of the enormous responsibility which rests on them in terms of their own peoples and all mankind.

But if the negative, deliberately pessimistic utterances concerning U.S.-Soviet relations now pouring forth from Washington are simply a bluff, an attempt to intimidate, then, indeed, it should have been realized long ago that no methods of pressure are effective on the Soviet Union — our leaders and our people have strong nerves.

Without letting itself be drawn into confrontation, the leadership of the USSR has stated clearly and precisely:

"The summit-level meeting is intended for negotiations, and negotiations on the basis of equality moreover, and not for the signing of an act of capitulation on somebody's part. All the more so inasmuch as we have not lost a war or even a battle to America, and we owe it absolutely nothing. Just as, for that matter, the United States owes us nothing.

#### Key Issue

There is still some time remaining before the Soviet-American summit, with which peoples throughout the world are linking their hopes for better things. And the opportunity is there for preparing for it in a proper manner, so as not to disappoint public opinion. One should not forget, however, that time does not stand still. The arms race is not ceasing, the regional conflicts are not abating, the process of international cooperation is encountering more and more new obstacles. "Time is running out," it was stated in the replies to TIME magazine, "the train may leave if we do not act fast enough."

Last Wednesday a White House spokesman stated that the U.S. President "has had the opportunity to study M.S. Gorbachev's interview," that he "approaches seriously the question of relations with the Soviet Union," and that "there is no reason why we should not attain some degree of success — if both sides approach the meeting in a constructive manner." However, the White House spokesman thereupon stated that the President has not changed his viewpoint on the issue of creating space armaments. Yet it is precisely this issue that has now become the stumbling block at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva and, moreover, may become the chief obstacles to the smoothing out of Soviet-American relations as a whole!

It is indeed impossible to take seriously the spurious arguments that the United States has supposedly undertaken only "scientific research" in order to ascertain whether or not it is possible to create a "defensive" space weapon that could liquidate offensive nuclear arms. Such arguments disintegrate when confronted with the real actions of the United States in this sphere. It is no coincidence that on the instructions of the U.S. President preparations for the operational testing of an antisatellite weapon are being accelerated right now.

Touching on the prospects for the forthcoming Soviet-American summit, a U.S. State Department spokesman asserted this week that Washington is preparing for it "in the hope of achieving considerable progress in all spheres" and "seeks to place U.S.-Soviet relations on a more stable foundation." But Washington knows that a stable foundation can only be met by ensuring mutual security, and the key role in the solution of this task must belong to an accord on the nonmilitarization of space in conjunction with the reduction of nuclear weapons, as was agreed in January by the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state.

The U.S. Administration is well aware that if there is no ban on the militarization of space and if an arms race in space is not prevented, then neither will there be an agreement on limiting and reducing nuclear arms and neither will there be anything at all. And it would be time to draw the appropriate conclusions from this, if Washington really wishes to achieve "considerable progress in all spheres."

For indeed "the train may leave" and the entire situation will become still more dangerous!

"The peoples of the world must be vigilant; war must be averted before it breaks out; it is essential to consolidate the unity of all peace forces and peoples in the struggle to avert nuclear war and to save peace and life on earth" -- this statement by the World Peace Council published 31 August is being perceived by all sane-minded people on earth in the current international situation as a call to action.

The growing awareness on the part of the broadest social forces of the acuteness of the time we are living through is generating a resurgence of the antiwar movements. The antiwar actions carried out last week by the working class in many countries within the framework of trade union actions for peace were an expressive manifestation of this upsurge.

Ahead lies a new series of mass actions; in October, peace supporters in all countries will hold the traditional week of struggle for disarmament in accordance with the appeal of the United Nations and the World Peace Council. This year it will surely be of an even more mass character than usual: The ever more complex situation in the world demands the tireless heightening of the peoples' vigilance, and people are realizing this more and more.

CSO: 5200/1396

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRANCE'S FABIUS ON SPACE ARMS AT IHEDN

AB232236 Paris Diplomatic Information Service in English 1352 GMT 20 Sep 85

[Speech by Prime Minister Laurent Fabius at the Institute of Higher National Defense Studies on 13 September]

[Text] A year ago, in my address to those embarking on the 1984-85 course at the IHEDN [Institute of Higher National Defense Studies], I asked my listeners to reflect on two main features that determine all the government's action: the drawing together of the French and modernization. These features apply to national defence. The armed forces still retain the practically unanimous support of the French people as a whole and the qualities of patriotism and a positive attitude to defence are present and, I believe, inviolable.

As regards modernization, social attitudes are gradually having to take account of its necessity. The idea of modernity and the efforts it demands are, despite the difficulties, making headway in our industry, our administration, our education system, and our social relations. Of course, our defence policy reflects this progress and our armed forces have estimated themselves as one of components of our society most capable of modernizing itself.

Three indissociable measures have provided concrete evidence of that will to modernize our defence.

First of all, the continuous modernization of our nuclear forces. This is vital in order to maintain their credibility, is an absolute priority and the reason for our tests in the Pacific and is something that the president of the republic is always determinedly emphasizing, as, for example, he did when the strategic submarine Inflexible, fitted with the new multiple-head M-4 missile, set off on its first operational patrol.

Another tool of our modernization: The Rapid Action Force (FAR--Force d'Action Rapide). It was set up within the planned time-schedule and unambiguously demonstrates our will and ability to intervene inside and outside Europe. That force, which is not designed for use within NATO's integrated forces, will be a versatile, very mobile tool with excellent anti-tank fire power. The FAR makes it possible to act, if necessary, in the first hours of a conflict or crisis.

I shall also stress the continuous modernization of our field force. Major projects, such as the future main battle tank and Franco-German combat helicopter, provide a long-term guarantee that the constant adaptation will continue.

The FAR and our field force give our forces efficacy and coherence within our global deterrent strategy. Pre-strategic weapons have a role in this approach. They provide the means to serve a final warning, under the president of the republic's sole responsibility, to a power threatening our vital interests. No super artillery and even less the instrument of a limited strike, they clearly indicate that the nature of our response has changed and that the next step will take the form of resorting to strategic weapons.

By organizing this year manoeuvres at Army Corps level with our German allies, we have, moreover, clearly demonstrated our intention to exercise in full our political solidarity, if need be, at military level.

So we are making headway with our modernization. As always, our defence is keeping pace with the progress in our economy and society.

#### Main Features of French Strategy

A modern defence strategy is constantly evolving, but it remains rooted in a few principles. Accordingly, France bases her strategy on that of nuclear deterrence of a stronger adversary by a lesser power. Twenty-five years of efforts have given us credible and diversified means to protect, in complete independence, our vital interests. The resulting strategy of denying any enemy action is a non-war strategy. It is based on three types of forces: land, air and maritime.

Another inviolable principle: the defence of our country's interests in the world and respect for our alliance, our military agreements and our friendships. Thanks to the modernization of our intervention forces we can remain at the level of the threat. We saw for example in Chad last year that France would give a friendly country the means it had requested from us to safeguard its independence.

Our nuclear attack submarine building programme, the building now underway of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier and the decision to set up a well-equipped military base in New Caledonia are also evidence of France's world role and her determination to provide for her own defence. Our capability of action at sea and overseas constitutes one of the most essential requirements of that defence. Tomorrow, that capability will find new fields of application in the exploitation of the riches of the sea and use of space.

The two principles I have just set out: loyalty to the nuclear deterrent strategy and France's world role are particularly clearly illustrated this very day by the president of the republic's presence in Mururoa after a stopover in Kourou in Guyana. A nuclear and Pacific power, France has in that region of the world interests that are vital to her independence. We shall remain vigilant to ensure they are not damaged. The nuclear tests will continue on that



territory of the republic, as President Mitterrand made clear, for as long as the French authorities, and they alone, consider them necessary for the country's defence.

The same loyalty to our traditions and the same will to open up future prospects are found in France's action to promote disarmament. The legitimate pursuit of security has in the case of the two superpowers been transformed into an arms race. This excessive arms build-up entails considerable expenditure. It is all the more shocking in that while it is going on men are dying of hunger, with the developed countries unable to provide effective help. Yet underdevelopment is not just a matter of human hardship, it also generates instability, and constitutes an aggravating factor for the security of the regions involved. The president of the republic proposed at the UN on 28 September 1983 that, after serious preparation, a conference should be convened with an agenda aimed at encouraging aid to development using resources released by disarmament measures. [Sentence as received]

This year negotiations opened between the Americans and Soviets in Geneva. We want them to produce a genuine agreement. We have refused to allow the French force to be included in the reckoning because it is independent and bears no relation whatsoever to the arsenals of the two superpowers who must make the first moves. Only a balance of forces at the lowest possible level can, in our view, bring about security and reassure the countries which like ours, want to maintain peace.

We are also in favour of an intensification of the negotiations under way at the Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe. Before its discussions are suspended in July 1986, we would like to obtain significant concrete results regarding the strengthening of security in our continent. That disarmament conference is a forum in which the imbalances in conventional weapons may be genuinely discussed.

As regards space, we want to avoid the emergence of weapons with a very high destabilizing power. We made constructive proposals along these lines in Geneva. We want the 1972 ABM treaty maintained. We consider that the research, which, moreover, is being conducted on both sides, must remain in conformity with the treaty.

France will not depart from those principles. There is no better basis from which to start thinking about the future.

#### A Changing World

Since last year, modernity has been posing an increasing number of questions for our defence, whether as regards the American Strategic Defence Initiative [SDI], Europe's awareness of the technological challenges or its mobilization, at France's initiative, in the Eureka Project.

In the military sphere, as in the economic one, we are living through a changing world. This is due to an eruption of the new technologies that are revolutionizing the areas of data processing, materials, living matter, energy

and mechanical engineering. These new technologies, which all have in common the need for considerable investments, may be the key to important strategic developments.

The two superpowers, who have reached a historically unprecedented level of arms and destructive capability, certainly confront each other on the ideological front, but they do so above all in the desire for power. They are now directing all their arsenals and scientific quality of their weapons and to occupy a dominant position in the dialectics of deterrence in which the perception of the threat the other party poses, takes precedence over its reality.

It is in this context that we must analyse the American Strategic Defence Initiative, which could modify the world strategic order we have experienced for about twenty years.

The American programme was initially presented as a defensive one, designed to destroy, in flight, attacking missiles and no longer to wipe out the adversary's silos through a preventive strike or strike towns in retaliation. However, if carried out, it would actually involve developing and installing new weapons in space.

If this system came into existence, it would lead to the deployment of other competing systems. It would thus result in the generation of new offensive weapons. The fight between shield and sword would enter a new era. The president of the republic has particularly stressed our opposition to everything that would lead to an excessive arms build-up in space.

We are not unaware of the USSR's efforts in the field of anti-missile and anti-satellite weapons, but despite that we do not support the general concept underlying the SDI, namely that nuclear weapons would become powerless and would be superseded. We find that notion highly hypothetical and therefore questionable. The importance of technologies which, in some cases, don't yet exist, must not be a reason for brutal change in strategic concept.

There are no grounds for thinking that the offensive capabilities could disappear in a foreseeable future. We also think it questionable whether one should seek to base a current strategic concept on remote technological possibilities. It is above all dangerous to seek support for a problematical strategy by holding forth in terms that in effect devalue what constitutes, and will do so for a long time to come, the very basis of our security: the nuclear deterrent.

In the state of uncertainty that surrounds it, this American initiative may thus be a stabilizing factor on the strategic scene as a whole. Under these conditions, France is not in a position to support it.

On the other hand, we are seeing the spin-offs for American research and industry of a programme with expectations of 26 billion dollars of expenditure over five years. So we are determined, even though this is no new resolution, to intensify technological efforts in Europe still further so as not to lag behind when it comes to this gigantic mobilization of funds.

The technological break-through that is beginning before our eyes will have repercussions even outside the nuclear and space fields. It will drastically change conventional methods of combat and the foreseeable general developments will affect all the strategic options. Anyone unable to make the necessary investments in men and money, will find it no longer possible to enjoy virtually any freedom of action. The scale of the financing of a nuclear power like France has to have, means that a clear line must be drawn between what is undertaken in cooperation with others and what must remain strictly national.

#### Future Prospects

In the face of these changes in world balances, I should like to stress two future developments on which France must resolutely embark: an increased role for Europe in its own defence effort and the mobilization on a gigantic scale of efforts to master the technologies of the future, particularly of space.

Ever since the decision to leave the integrated military organization, General de Gaulle set out to define, with our allies the form of our military cooperation. That process has never stopped. It has become one of the cornerstones of France's foreign policy. The future of our defence cannot be disassociated from that of Europe.

France has proposed to her six partners in Western European Union that that organisation should be revitalized in order to provide a forum for discussion of their common specific interests in security matters.

Aware of the developments in the concept of European security, France, who since 1982 has been reactivating the provisions of the Elysee Treaty, has established with the Federal Republic of Germany a structure of diplomatic and military cooperation unparalleled in Europe. Those involved are working pragmatically and painstakingly to give concrete form to our growing community of interests in the field of security.

That solidarity is happily enhanced by our traditional relations with Great Britain, the only European nuclear power other than France.

In this context, it is important to pay more attention to developing effective strategic cooperation between Europeans, without ignoring the absolute necessity of a significant American presence at our side.

At the military level, the interoperability and wherever possible standardization of Western European forces must be increased in the light of the fierceness of technological competition and spiraling cost of modern weapons. A fair assessment of requirements and skills ought to make it possible in many cases to find joint European solutions.

When it comes to manufacturing European weapons, there are--Why deny it?--genuine difficulties resulting from the inevitable competitive nature of dynamic national concerns. The high quality of the products from across the Atlantic and the need for certain European countries to participate in the financing of

the American guarantee make things even more difficult. This must in no way make us give up the constant search for fair compromises aimed at producing high performance products. Europe has demonstrated her capabilities by carrying out many programmes such as Eurodif, Ariane and Airbus.

The history of European weapons production is punctuated by enough successes for everyone to go on making the necessary efforts. The third-generation anti-tank missile and helicopter engine programmes must be followed by others. We have decided to pursue the development of a ground support plane corresponding to our needs and based on our industrial and commercial know-how. It is different from the Interceptor on which the four countries with which we were discussing are going to cooperate, but in our view the way to coordinated aircraft production still seems open.

The intention of the Eureka Project proposed by France is to get the European nations, some of whom don't belong to the alliance, to produce the very high-technology equipment we need to make a success of the future. Unlike the Strategic Defence Initiative it is not an arms programme, even though the spin-offs on the strategic level are nevertheless obvious for those European countries who decide to support it.

We have to ensure that, against the background of American and Japanese dynamism, Europe is present on a massive scale in the civil advanced technology sectors and makes up the ground it has lost through the dissipation of efforts.

The Eureka Project will lead to greater solidarity in Europe in the field of high technology. Jean Monnet was already talking about the solidarity achieved in Europe when he launched the European Coal and Steel Community about thirty years ago.

Today, France expects Eureka to strengthen the solidarity already achieved in Europe through voluntary agreements between two or more European concerns not only in the areas of information technology, telecommunications, robotics, materials, automated manufacturing techniques and vegetable and living resources technology, but also in the field of advanced techniques in environmental protection and transport.

Promoters of Eureka projects will certainly learn from the model of cooperation constituted by the European Space Agency.

Europe's capability in space, amply demonstrated by Ariane's successive launches, will, we hope, lead as soon as possible to the specifications for the European orbital shuttle being drawn up and the craft being developed.

As you can see, France does not want either to get left behind or impose her way of doing things in the processes of change under way. True to her principles, she is determining her own responses, without ignoring the importance of either the strategic or industrial stakes. It is the importance of these stakes that you will have to gauge during your sessions, while keeping in mind the prime requirement of France's independence in a context of solidarity with her allies.



More than ever before, the development of weapons systems and diversity of the theatres of operation are making us aware of the links between economic and military power. Our whole policy of modernization is contributing to France's defence effort and, more specifically, the modernization of our means of production and of our education system, together with France's action in favour of Third World development.

One cannot have a positive attitude to defence without also having (?means) to modernization. They are both fired by the same vigilance, the same determination to the independent to which our people have a firm commitment. [sentence as received] That shows you, too, the importance of civil defence which makes it possible to fight off all forms of threats and destabilization. The minister of the interior and decentralization, with the collaboration of the other ministers and particularly the minister of defence, have made progress in drawing up an active policy in this sphere. It will result in greater responsibility at local levels so that the populations concerned can be increasingly involved in the various protection plans.

Yes, our whole nation must now be keyed up for the effort of maintaining and if possible increasing our country's strength. They are making this effort for their economy and they are making it for their defence, conscious that patriotism is an efficient and powerful quality when it comes to winning the battles of modernity.

Against a foreseeable background of radical changes in a great many strategic factors, due to the emergence of new technologies, the French deterrent strategy must retain its independence and credibility. While this strategy remains resolutely tied up with our nuclear forces, modernized in the light of the development of the attacker's defences, it must also take into account the changes of scale necessitated by the mastering of the new technologies and particularly those of space. Europe can take up the challenge provided both its leaders and peoples can sort out wheat from the chaff.

Finally, we must make a determined effort to make wisdom and the will to cooperate bring about a disarmament policy at world level. [sentence as received] Without showing weakness, but without skepticism either, we must act to win the peace, the ultimate constant goal of our defence effort.

CSO: 5200/2788

## NORWEGIAN LABOR PARTY ORGAN ATTACKS GOVERNMENT'S SDI STAND

Oglo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 26 Jul 85 p 4

[Editorial: "No; well, yes!"]

[Text] Norway said "no" to participating in the American Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars) program—or at least that is what we thought. But now it appears that Norway's "no" does not mean "no" at all. From the United States, where Prime Minister Willoch is at present, we learn that Norway's "no" by no means excludes the possibility of contracts with Norwegian companies "that might be interested in taking part in research on and the development of the civilian part of the project."

Actually a very interesting development is taking place now where Norway's relationship with the Star Wars program is concerned: During the past week, a committee set up by the Prime Minister's office that consists of Director Klippenberg of the Defense Research Institute, Professor Slette of the Norwegian Technical University and the former Deputy Director of Defense Research, Bjorn Grandal, told us that the Star Wars system is not a scientific impossibility, that it will have very appreciable consequences of a civilian nature and that Norway may be in danger of getting into a technological impasse if it participates in the project. AFTENPOSTEN, the Willoch government's indefatigable mouthpiece—which, since Mr Sundar took over the top management, has really begun to regard the Willoch government as AFTENPOSTEN's executive authority—falls in line with the committee's conclusions. The paper castigates the parties that fall between the Labor Party and the Conservative Party for Norway's answer of "no" to participation in Star Wars efforts, and it stresses the fact that it is "of the greatest importance for the government to do its utmost to keep all options open," after all.

If we had been Kjell Magne Bondevik or Kare Kristiansen—and had not had those two men's blind love for ministerial office—we would now have been, as it says in the Scriptures "very apprehensive" in regard to what is happening in the Conservative Party. And here we are not thinking about the fact that Erling Norvik would like to turn water into wine, but about the fact that Kare Willoch is trying to turn a

"no" into a "yes" where Norway and participation in the Star Wars project are concerned.

To the Conservative Party and the Prime Minister's "committee of experts," we would like to say the following: naturally, the development of some kind of anti-guided-missile-defense in space is not a scientific impossibility. That is not the point. The point is that much greater scientists than Klipenberg, Slette and Grandal long ago established the fact that the system will not be effective. It is poor comfort to be told that the system will some time or other be able to wipe out 80 percent of the attacking enemy missiles when half of those that slip through are more than enough to annihilate the entire world. In the meantime, an arms race in space would also mean a more intensive arms race on earth, with the Soviets trying to out-manuever the Americans with the help of relatively inexpensive and demonstratively simpler countermeasures. Hans A. Bethe has said, in regard to the Star Wars project, that it is hard to imagine a system that could cause a catastrophe more easily.

For the present, we would like to say to gullible representatives of the parties that fall between the Labor Party and the Conservative Party, that they should take note of yesterday's reports from Washington: the fact that, when it comes right down to it, it perhaps will not be so easy to distinguish between the military and "the civilian" parts of the Star Wars project. What is military research and what is civilian research, it was said, will not be made clear until later!

9266

CSO: 5200/2614

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

DIVISIONS IN NORWAY'S RULING COALITION OVER SDI ROLE

Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 7 Sep 85 p 4

[Editorial: "Star Wars"]

[Text] Representatives for the governing parties continue to wrangle over the Norwegian participation in the American research program connected with President Reagan's Star Wars program. Christian Peoples Party's Harald Synnes thinks any participation in research connected to the program is incompatible with the Storting's decision. The Conservative Party's Jo Benkow, on the other hand, thinks that we all should be happy over Prime Minister Willoch having opened participation in the project to Norwegian research institutions and Norwegian industry.

Meanwhile, one of the world's leading scientists, Dr David Baker, has joined in the chorus of the Star Wars critics. Baker, who is director of Space Services International, and has 3 years experience from the American Space Administration, NASA, has characterized President Reagan's space weapons program as "a threat against the entire planet's sanity and survivability."

Jo Benkow must excuse us, but we are anything but happy over the prime minister's "opening maneuvers."

CSO: 5200/2784



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SPANISH COMMITTEE TO STUDY 'STAR WARS' PARTICIPATION

PM121042 Madrid ABC in Spanish 10 Sep 85 p 13

[Unattributed report: "Spain Studies Taking Part in 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] The Ministry of Industry and Energy has appointed a committee which will study possible Spanish participation in the U.S. "star wars" project, according to statements made by Director General of Industrial Innovation and Technology Florencio Ornia in Santander yesterday. Ornia added that this committee will assess the advantages and drawbacks of our participation and the real prospects for cooperation which Spain has in projects of this nature.

So far, the director general added, there is "absolutely nothing decided" because the "star wars" program is a program in which enterprises, and not administrations, will have to take part directly, unlike, for instance, the European fighter aircraft, which is a direct commitment to finance a specific project in which one of the parties is the Spanish Government.

Florencio Ornia pointed out that a priority of the Ministry of Industry is the integration of the new technologies into Spain and our alignment with the possessors of them. If the attainment of these aims, he stressed, entails acceptance of some rules of control over reexport, already accepted by neighboring countries, "no objections or obstacles which could jeopardize them will be raised by the Ministry of Industry."

CSO: 5200/2777

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

GREEK SPOKESMAN CLARIFIES PAPOULIAS 'STAR WARS' REMARK

NC121430 Athens ATHENS NEWS in English 12 Sep 85 p 4

[Text] Greece opposed all technological developments that hastened the arms race, including the U.S. space-based defence project known as "star wars", government spokesman Konstandinos Laliotis said Wednesday.

"The Greek Government rejects the development of any programme of new technology that is linked with the upgrading of armaments, and so it cannot be anything but categorically opposed...to the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) of the U.S. known as 'star wars', Laliotis told a news briefing.

Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias made a statement about "star wars" Tuesday that was interpreted by some newspapers as meaning Greece was interested in playing a part in the project. Papoulias, in a written parliamentary answer, referred both to "star wars" and France's proposal for a European high technology research project known as Eureka, and added: "The whole issue is being studied by the (Greek) authorities in the light of government positions on disarmament and possible benefits to our country from new technological developments."

But Laliotis said Wednesday that this comment referred to Eureka, not "star wars."

CSO: 5200/2777

ITALIAN CP NATTA AT L'UNITA FESTIVAL ON U.S. ASAT TEST

Milan L'UNITA in Italian 16 Sep 85 pp 1-2

[Rocco Di Biasi report: "Time for Left To Counterattack"]

[Excerpt] Then there is the major issue of peace: "Reagan has responded to the Soviet suspension of nuclear explosions with a worrying act--the testing of the antisatellite weapon in space. It is not enough to hope that the wish for detente will be fulfilled." "Something has been achieved," Natta added. "But a great deal more can be done within the EC and NATO and with a national initiative. This is no time for ruses, for ambiguity, or for feigning disagreement while actually guaranteeing support. We ask that Italy speak out clearly against another arms race and against the militarization of space. Other Atlantic countries and governments have already spoken out. Why should Italy not do so? "This," the party secretary general stressed, "is a context in which the broadest national agreement and understanding should be built."

CSO: 5200/2787

8 October 1985

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

## BRIEFS

FRG EXPERTS AT 'STAR WARS' TALKS--Washington--The 30-man German delegation of experts headed by adviser to the chancellor, Horst Teltschik, that has been touring the United States for 10 days, and gathering information on the Strategic Defense Initiative, returned on Saturday to Bonn with "satisfactory" answers. The U.S. discussion partners gave frank and detailed answers to all questions asked, it was said in delegation circles. The German commission will most likely suggest to the Federal Government in Bonn that it conclude a framework agreement with the U.S. Government that will permit German industry to take part in Strategic Defense Initiative research projects. [Excerpt] [Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG in German 15 Sep 85 p 2]

FRANCE REITERATES EUREKA IMPORTANCE--As a nuclear power and a power in the Pacific, France has interests in this region of the world that are essential to its independence. This is what Laurent Fabius, who chaired the opening of the 38th session of the Institute of Higher Studies of National Defense, said this morning in Paris. The prime minister also recalled the modernization efforts undertaken by France in the spheres of nuclear weapons, the rapid deployment force and combat forces. He also insisted on the importance of the Eureka project, the idea of which was launched by Mr Mitterrand himself. This is why, Laurent Fabius said in conclusion, amid the predictable upheaval of many strategic factors owing to the emergence of new technologies, the French deterrent strategy must maintain its independence and credibility. [Text] [Paris Domestic Service in French 1200 GMT 13 Sep 85]

CSO: 5200/2777



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### PRC COMMENTARY ON SUMMIT, GENEVA TALKS

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English 16 Sep 85 p 13

[Article by Ren Wenhui]

[Text]

AS the date of the US-Soviet summit draws near, the war of words between the two countries seems to get fiercer. Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said recently that his country's relations with Washington had worsened in the last two months. Since the summit was announced in the early July, three major indicators of this situation have taken place:

On July 29, Gorbachev announced a moratorium on nuclear tests starting from August 6. If the United States agreed to take similar measures, the Soviet leader said, the term of the moratorium could be extended. Washington rejected the proposal, meanwhile inviting the Soviet Union to send an observer to the US testing ground. The American counterproposal was also rejected.

On August 20, President Ronald Reagan notified Congress that the first test of an anti-satellite (ASAT) weapon would be soon carried out. Moscow attacked the US decision, saying that the test would contravene the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty and the international convention on the peaceful use of outer space.

On August 21, the United States accused the Soviet Union of using tracking chemicals which might cause cancer to monitor the activities of US diplomats in Moscow. The Soviet Union denied the charge as "absurd lies" aimed at poisoning relations between the two countries.

In spite of these events, however, the summit is needed by both sides. As some analysts point out, their current verbal battles are intended to win over public opinion and put pressure on the other side to make concessions. As early as the beginning of this year, Reagan began asking to meet the Soviet leader. In March, when Gorbachev took up the post of General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, a message from Reagan was passed to him inviting him to visit Washington.

Reagan hopes through the summit to lend new impetus to the arms control talks in Geneva, which are currently mired in disagreement. With the US budget deficit in 1984 reaching as high as US\$200 billion, the White House thinks it is wise to get the arms race under control.

As for the Soviet Union, it wants the summit too. The United States has recently made major breakthroughs in the military technology, particularly the space weapons which Moscow feels so anxious to contain. In addition, Gorbachev faces grave economic problems at home. So, the moratorium on the arms contest in space is in keeping with Soviet interests.

But if the superpowers each need the summit, and are in fact actively preparing for it in order to achieve positive results, neither side is willing to budge from its current bargaining position. The Soviet moratorium proposal is seen in Washington as a trap to halt further US nuclear weapons development. Similarly, the Kremlin believes Reagan's invitation to send an observer to US tests is an excuse to force the Soviet Union to open its own testing ground — an idea that does not conform to Moscow's thinking.

On space weaponry, the United States holds that the Soviet Union already has an anti-satellite weapon system availa-

ble for deployment in the outer space, while the United States is only preparing its system. But according to experts in the field, the US space weapon is smaller and more effective than those of the Soviet Union.

Moscow declared two years ago that it was committed unilaterally to a moratorium on testing and deploying anti-satellite weapons. When Washington announced its test plan, the TASS news agency said the Soviet Union would consider itself free of its commitment if the US went ahead with the experiment.

Washington argued that its plan is based on establishing an equilibrium of forces with Moscow, while Moscow alleged that the two sides' military strength is now about equal.

Thus, easing the arms race stands first on the summit agenda. But if the two leaders continue their verbal battles during this vital session, they can hardly restore stable relations between their governments — no matter how well they get to know each other personally at the summit.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

XINHUA REPORTS GROMYKO'S CONDEMNATION OF U.S. STANCE

OW240240 Beijing XINHUA in English 0232 GMT 24 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 23 (XINHUA) -- Soviet President Andrey Gromyko today accused the United States of failing to take any measures to reduce nuclear arms and improve the international political climate.

During his meeting with a Luxemburg delegation headed by President Leon Bollendorf, the Soviet president said that if Western countries, the United States in particular, accept Soviet proposals on preventing the militarization of outer space and reducing the arms race an end to confrontation could result. He also accused some West European countries of "blindly following the U.S. policies." The former Soviet foreign minister called for a restored atmosphere of detente and security and said small countries in Europe can and should play an important role towards that end.

Gromyko's words coincide with the on-going third round of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on space, strategic and medium-range weapons, which began last week. So far there have been no signs of major breakthroughs in the negotiations.

CSO: 5200/4053

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NETHERLANDS LABOR PARTY ON CRUISE MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

PM260851 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 19 Aug 85 p 3

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report: "Labor Party: Nuclear Power Stations Will Not Be Closed Immediately"]

[Excerpt] The Hague, 19 Aug--The Labor Party [PvdA] has abandoned its demand that the existing Netherlands nuclear power stations be closed down as soon as this is technically possible. In the new draft election manifesto the party executive only advocates "accelerated closure." However, the timing of such closure will be dependent on financial and economic considerations. Party Chairman van den Berg, however, adheres to the party's old position on this issue and has expressed his reservations at the new party stance. But the PvdA remains opposed to the construction of new nuclear power stations.

The PvdA is also adhering to its "no" to the deployment of cruise missiles on Netherlands territory. On Saturday [17 August] party parliamentary group leader den Uyl and party chairman van den Berg stressed at the press conference held to present the manifesto that the PvdA will not abandon this stance in coalition negotiations. The manifesto contains nothing to cover what the party would do if an agreement on deployment enshrined in a treaty with the United States is reached during the life of the present Cabinet. In the past the PvdA has stated repeatedly that in government it would reverse such an agreement as soon as possible. Den Uyl described such a position as "totally premature" at the present time. According to den Uyl the PvdA is taking as its point of departure that a deployment decision could still be prevented during the life of the present Cabinet, in part with the support of the people's petition against cruise missiles.

The new manifesto does not mention how many Netherlands nuclear units should be disbanded in the next Cabinet period (1986-90). The PvdA wants the rate of closure to be dependent on the influence this will have on the realization of a nuclear-free Europe and the positive effect this could have on the disarmament negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The present PvdA program states that the number of Netherlands nuclear units should be limited to 1 or 2 and that the other 4 or 5 nuclear units would be disbanded within 4 years.

In the next 4-year period the PvdA does not want to make any increase in defense spending. Consequently, they want to break the agreement within NATO for an annual 3-percent growth in defense spending.

CSO: 5200/2760



INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH INFLUENCE ON U.S. MISSILE LAUNCHINGS VIEWED AS MINIMAL

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 18 Sep 85 p 3

[Article by editor Jan Gerritsen: "Launching of Missiles an Affair of the United States"]

[Text] Brussels, 18 Sep. It is totally theoretical to suppose that the Netherlands would be able to prevent the launching of NATO nuclear weapons from its territory if a war situation should arise and the American president has approved the use of nuclear weapons.

This was said by a NATO expert in reference to the article by Second Chamber member K.G. de Vries (PvdA) in the coming issue of SOCIALISME EN DEMOCRATIE, in which he states that a deployment of American cruise missiles in Woensdrecht would bring with it a "hollowing out" of Dutch sovereignty. De Vries bases his reasoning on the difference in "having a say": The American president decides exclusively on the launching of cruise missiles; NATO countries can to a certain extent share in the decision on the use of NATO nuclear weapons.

NATO has three states of alarm: simple, reinforced, and general alert. The lattermost state is announced if there is an actual attack carried out on the territory of NATO states and thus it is a case of a war situation. During both simple and reinforced alerts, the NATO countries independently take a number of steps (mobilization, proclamation of umbrella laws, and so on) which are subsequently approved by the Defense Planning Committee of NATO (DPC--composed of the ambassadors of the NATO countries). Each land keeps the freedom to refrain from certain measures.

In the case of a hostile attack on NATO, the "general alert" is proclaimed. In accordance with existing agreements, the armed forces of the NATO countries automatically come under the command of SACEUR, the (American) supreme commander of NATO. The NATO supreme commander needs no approval from the DPC to act vigorously against the aggression.

Only in this phase does the consultation over the possible use of nuclear weapons come into play: Any one of the three highest NATO commanders (SACEUR, the commander for the Atlantic Ocean, or the commander for the English Channel), as well as the government of any NATO country, may request the use of nuclear weapons. The military commanders must indicate what weapons they wish to use against which targets. Such a request is once again discussed in the

DPC and in accordance with the so-called Athens guidelines of 1962, the countries which are directly involved have an especially large voice in the decision.

In a concrete example: The SACEUR might ask to use Dutch F-16 airplanes, which are equipped with nuclear bombs. These planes are part of the integrated NATO command. Netherlands might say that it objects to this use. The decision on the use of nuclear weapons is made ultimately by the American president, who is informed by the NATO secretary general about the opinion of the DPC. If the president approved the request by SACEUR to launch nuclear weapons, the Netherlands technically could still state that it was withdrawing its F-16 planes from the NATO supreme command. However, this is viewed as being completely theoretical, because after all this is a matter of a war situation and the national military chains of command have been dropped. Practically speaking, the only possibility then to prevent the use of the Dutch F-16 fighters with their nuclear bombs is a request to the SACEUR not to use the F-16s. It is very doubtful whether the SACEUR would accede to this request if he had already received permission from the American president to use them, according to the explanation by the NATO expert.

CSO: 5200/2785

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON U.S. BINARY WEAPONS

PM091501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 85 First Edition p 6

[Editorial article: "Dangerous Plans of Transatlantic 'Chemists'"]

[Text] Washington is taking dangerous new steps on the path of broadening the arms race, exacerbating international tension, and increasing the threat of war. Under pressure from the American Administration, the U.S. Congress has voted for resolutions that give the "green light" to the mass production of binary chemical ammunition, this new variety of the barbarous weapons of mass destruction. This step, in the opinion of Washington strategists, is to have great significance for the practical realization of NATO's aggressive military-strategic concept. For this provides for "interaction between conventional, nuclear, chemical, and electronic means of waging war" when conducting combat operations. And as regards chemical means, the chief gamble is made precisely on binary chemical weapons.

The decision of Congress provides for the allocation of \$155 million in fiscal 1986, which begins 1 October, for the purpose of preparing for chemical warfare. But this is just the tip of the iceberg, as the saying goes. It is planned to throw millions of dollars onto the altar of preparations for chemical warfare. According to American sources, the program for the modernization of the U.S. military chemical arsenal will swallow up more than \$10 billion over the course of 5 years. It provides for an increase in the quantity of chemical ammunition from the present 3 million to 5 million units.

Thus, it is a question of far-reaching plans to build up U.S. "military muscle," in which chemical weapons in conjunction with other new arms systems -- MX and Trident-2 ballistic missiles, missile-carrying submarines, strategic aircraft, and the space strike means which are being created -- according to the designs of Washington "hawks," are to secure U.S. military superiority over the Soviet Union and make it possible for American imperialism to dictate its will to the world's peoples.

As is the custom on the banks of the Potomac, new militarist efforts are being made there to the accompaniment of a fraudulent ballyhoo about a "Soviet military threat" and equally false arguments about an imaginary U.S. "military lag." Both are lies of the highest order. The Soviet Union, which invariably pursues a policy of peace and cooperation among the peoples, threatens no one with anything. As regards the correlation of military forces as a whole, there currently exists an approximate military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

In the sphere of chemical warfare it is precisely the United States that now possesses the most sizable arsenal of these mass destruction weapons. According to data from foreign specialists and authoritative international organizations, the Pentagon now has 55,000 metric tons of highly toxic nerve gases. Some 150,000 metric tons (more than 3 million units) of chemical ammunition equipped with these toxins are ready for combat use. These stocks are sufficient to destroy all mankind several times over.

Ten percent of the shells, mines, and aerial bombs in the U.S. chemical arsenal are in Europe -- mostly at dumps in the FRG. Chemical weapons are also stockpiled at U.S. military bases in Britain and Italy and on aircraft carriers on station in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

This is how things really stand as regards the imaginary U.S. "lag," as well as, incidentally, the feigned complaints that the American chemical weapon stocks kept in the United States and in West Europe are "hopelessly obsolete" and cannot serve as a "deterrent." The decision to embark on the mass production of binary ammunition has certainly been dictated not by defense considerations but by the bellicose, adventurist plans of the American military. C. Weinberger once frankly declared that the United States would constantly threaten the Soviet Union with the use of chemical weapons and would consider the possibility of using them in any military conflict.

Preparations for the production of a new generation of chemical weapons are already in full swing in the United States. As THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, the conveyor belts of a Pentagon chemical complex designed for the production of binary ammunition are ready to start work in the city of Pine Bluff (Arkansas). On reaching full capacity, this plant will be able to produce more than 70,000 units of various types of ammunition a year. And the Pine Bluff plant is only the first aimed at producing new lethal binary toxins. It is known that there are 15 modern, mothballed plants in the United States with a productivity of hundreds of thousands of metric tons of chemical ammunition a year based on existing toxins, which could be commissioned at any moment.

What is the new kind of American chemical weapon like? It is called binary because it is based on the use of two components which, in themselves, are nontoxic or only slightly toxic but which react when mixed together to form a highly poisonous toxin.

This special feature of the new toxin is used by the advocates of the military-industrial complex to claim that it is "safe" and almost "humane." In fact, binary charges -- and it is planned to produce them at first in the form of Big Eye aerial bombs and artillery shells -- are a monstrous weapon of mass destruction, and the civilian population would be its primary victim in the event of its use. According to expert assessments, losses among the population would be 20-30 times greater than troop losses.

The question of where the Pentagon's new lethal "gifts" will be deployed is now being discussed on both sides of the Atlantic. Broad circles of the West European public are profoundly concerned at the possible catastrophic consequences of the decision adopted in Washington.

In an endeavor to lull the vigilance of members of the antiwar movement, Pentagon strategists say that binary charges can be kept at bases in the United States and transferred to Europe "only in the event of an international crisis," and that another possible variant is to deploy the new kinds of chemical weapons on U.S. Navy ships sailing off Europe's shores. However, the most zealous and open activists of the military-industrial complex among American generals and politicians frankly declare that the place for binary charges is where they are to be used -- on the territory of the West European NATO allies of the United States.



A characteristic episode occurred recently. As is known, Bonn's leading figures are more willing than other NATOites to subscribe to the "senior partner's" new military plans. And no sooner had A. Dregger, chairman of the Bundestag faction of the Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union, declared that U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has assured him that binary weapons would not be stationed in the FRG until there was some "threatening situation," then the Pentagon chief denied that statement. An official report disseminated by the American Embassy in the FRG states that Weinberger gave no such assurances and that, on the contrary, he praised these new weapons to Dregger "because they are easier to store and transport."

The U.S. military-industrial complex does not even wish to go along with the tactical propaganda games of its West European underlings, of those who are prepared to follow in the Pentagon's wake but who would like to disguise themselves slightly. Proceeding from its global military-political plans, Washington intends to speak with its "junior partners" in NATO in the language of orders. To abandon the deployment of new chemical weapons in West Europe, American Congressman John Spratt preaches, is "tantamount to indulging the Europeans' inclination to evade responsibility." "Precisely the Europeans," he says, "must produce and stockpile chemical weapons."

Of course, it is planned to deploy the binary neuroparalytic weapons above all on the territory of West European countries, where there are already thousands of tons of older American chemical ammunition. In this connection, we could also recall the statement by General B. Rogers, commander in chief of NATO allied armed forces Europe, that it is proposed to use binary weapons together with nuclear weapons at the very start of military operations precisely on the European Continent.

The decision of the American Administration and Congress to begin production of new kinds of toxins in conjunction with the other military programs being implemented by the United States, including the continuing deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries, as well as the plans to deploy large-scale ABM defenses with space-based elements, graphically demonstrates the adventurism and perfidy of Washington's designs. Having unleashed a nuclear missile and chemical war, the American "strategists" would like to "sit things out on the other side of the ocean" and expose their allies to a strike. It is not hard to imagine the apocalyptic consequences with which this threatens the densely populated West European countries. Having allocated to West Europe the role of a launch site for American Pershings and Tomahawks -- which naturally makes it a target for a nuclear counterstrike -- the transatlantic "chemists" would like to turn it also into a "binary gas chamber."

The true purport of Washington's propaganda and diplomatic maneuvers around the problem of chemical weapons becomes obvious in light of the recent actions of the American Administration and Congress. The slanderous U.S. fabrications about the use of Soviet-made toxins in Southeast Asia were indeed, above all, to cover up their own feverish efforts to build up arsenals of chemical death. It is also clear why the United States is doggedly seeking to deadlock the current Geneva talks on drawing up a convention to ban and destroy chemical weapons. Such a convention, which is advocated by the overwhelming majority of states, "does not suit" Washington. Does this not demonstrate the true worth of the peace-loving rhetoric with which the leaders of the U.S. Administration beguile the ears of the public?

The U.S. decision to begin accelerated work on the latest types of chemical arms throws down a challenge to the reason and conscience of the people. Washington has

announced its decision at a time when millions of people throughout the world are coming out increasingly actively for peace and cooperation and when they expect of political leaders restraint, state wisdom, and the resolution of complex international problems by means of talks. The chief responsibility for the consequences of this dangerous step lies with the U.S. Administration. But those figures in the West European NATO countries who, to please Washington, are prepared to appear in the role of traveling salesmen for chemical death will not succeed in evading it either.

The planned U.S. start for the production and deployment of binary chemical weapons arouses legitimate alarm and indignation everywhere, and in Europe above all. Politicians and entire parties and public organizations come out resolutely against the Pentagon's sinister, misanthropic, military programs and in favor of ending the production of chemical weapons and destroying stocks of them. The people quite rightly see the dangerous plans of the Washington "chemists" as a deadly threat to their future and to life itself on earth.

The Soviet Union's position with regard to chemical weapons is clear: There must be no place for these weapons on earth. Their production and deployment must end, and the existing stocks destroyed. The USSR reaffirms its readiness to actively cooperate with all peace-loving states to achieve these ends.

The bellicose adventurers from the banks of the Potomac do not give the world's people a single day's respite. They are doing everything to undermine peaceful, constructive relations among the peoples, to exacerbate tension, and to increase the threat of war. Following the American first-strike missiles being deployed on the territory of a number of NATO countries, they are ready to inundate West Europe with binary death. This cannot be permitted! The crime which is being prepared against peace and mankind must be prevented!

CSO: 5200/1396

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS CALLS U.S. CHEMICAL WEAPONS 'SPECIAL THREAT' TO EUROPE

LD111929 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 11 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 11 TASS—By TASS commentator Vadim Biryukov:

In case a zone free from chemical weapons is set up in central Europe, the U.S.S.R., following its fundamental foreign policy principles, would be prepared to guarantee and respect the status of that zone, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, said at a meeting in Moscow with Johannes Rau, vice-chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, prime minister of Land Northern Rhine-Westphalia.

Washington's stand on the issue is just the opposite. It takes new dangerous steps along the lines of expanding the arms race. On the initiative and with the connivance of the White House chemical weapons find their way to different continents. It should be noted that U.S. toxic agents constitute a special threat to Europe.

The U.S. Congress is considering a bill on the allocation of 155 million dollars on the production of binary munitions. Why did Washington's attention was attracted precisely to this type? [as received] The storage of obsolete chemical weapons in the United States is becoming more and more of a problem. There were cases when toxic agents leaked into the atmosphere. The problem of safety of the population in conjunction with the new types of such weapons caused concern in the U.S. Congress.

The invention of binary munitions was a way out of the situation -- the way out that seemed suitable from the point of view of the Pentagon. The manufacturing of the components harmless to the environment is to go on in the United States, while Washington "magnanimously" lets its European allies to put [as received] them together into lethally dangerous mass annihilation weapons and store them afterwards. What is bad for the Americans, people in the Congress might have reasoned, will do for the Europeans.

The U.S. military are going to send a new portion of chemical weapons to the Old World, whereas the Soviet Union proposes to set up a zone free from chemical weapons in Northern Europe. U.S. intentions constitute a threat to the Europeans, while the Soviet Union thinks of their security.

The Soviet stand on the issue is clear: There is no room for chemical weapons on earth. Their production and deployment should be stopped and the existing stockpiles of such weapons should be destroyed. Supporting the idea of the establishment in Northern Europe [of] a zone free from chemical weapons, the U.S.S.R. once again declares its readiness to cooperate with all peace loving nations in attaining these aims.

CSO: 5200/1396

**NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS**

**NEW ZEALAND'S LANGE TABLES NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE TREATY**

**HK171102 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 11 Sep 85 p 6**

[Text] The South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty signed at last month's South Pacific Forum meeting would put more pressure on France to stop its nuclear testing programme, the Prime Minister, Mr Lange, said yesterday.

Mr Lange tabled the text of the treaty and its associated draft protocols in Parliament yesterday. The treaty was signed on August 6.

The decision to adopt the treaty was "an important event in the history of co-operation among the countries of the South Pacific," Mr Lange told Parliament in a ministerial statement. "It is an act to strengthen regional security and to underline our mutual determination that nuclear weapons will not be possessed by any of us or stationed on our territories. The treaty will also provide a new means for providing pressure on France to halt its testing programme at Mururoa," he said.

The acting leader of the Opposition, Mr Bolger, said the treaty was a move by South Pacific nations to make the world "a little safer from nuclear war."

However, while it was important to note that the treaty did, in terms of an expression of intent and hope, it was also important to note what it did not do, Mr Bolger told Parliament. "It does not preclude countries entering into treaties with others that are nuclear capable, and it does not prevent nuclear-powered ships from coming through the South Pacific."

Therefore, the treaty would not reduce the number of nuclear weapons that traversed the area, he said.

**CSO: 5200/4357**



**NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS**

**NEW ZEALAND PRIME MINISTER ON RESPECT FOR U.S. POSITION**

**HK171124 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 11 Sep 85 p 6**

[Text] Policy or not, having weaponry in New Zealand was not negotiable, "but there is a need to respect the United States position that it will neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weaponry aboard its vessels -- we are not going to confront that," the Prime Minister, Mr Lange, told Parliament last night.

"We don't say for one moment that the United States should surrender its principle of neither confirming nor denying. I think it would be ludicrous to suggest that, but at the same time, New Zealand is not proposing to surrender its principle that it will not have nuclear weaponry here," he said. He made the remarks during debate on the Foreign Affairs appropriation, much of which centred on the ANZUS impasse.

Mr Lange referred to remarks by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr McLay, visiting the United States, as posturings against New Zealand's interests. They were a disgrace, he said, which toadied to right-wing paranoia in that country. "It is a tragedy for New Zealand that there is in that country now a member of the National Party front bench (Mr McLay) that is trying to stir up barriers against New Zealand.

"And I challenge the existing National Party here to call him to order from abroad and get him to keep quiet in the interests of New Zealand," Mr Lange said.

Earlier, acting Opposition Leader Mr Jim Bolger said the Government proposed to satisfy the electorate at home, particularly left-wing elements, at the expense of New Zealand's international standing. "I am fearful that the Labour Government does not intend to look at New Zealand's wider concerns and only intends to look at the narrower concerns of an electorate back here in New Zealand that they want to massage," Mr Bolger said.

If the Government's position was not negotiable, then why was it that the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Palmer, was going to Washington to discuss the proposed no-nuclear legislation?

Mr Bolger said he was concerned that the proposals being taken by Mr Palmer were not first but before the New Zealand Parliament.

Referring to the so-called "trust me" policy in determining whether vessels were nuclear armed, Mr Bolger invited Mr Lange to trust Parliament by telling it what was being taken to Washington.

Former Prime Minister Sir Robert Muldoon said the anti-nuclear policy was alienating not only the U.S. but the whole of the Western alliance. "His ambassador (Sir Wallace Rowling) will tell him that our friends in Washington, many good friends, have said to him the Labour Party's antics over ANZUS have taken away from us the only card we had to play in helping New Zealand on all kinds of issues," Sir Robert said.

Sir Robert criticised Mr Lange's handling of foreign affairs, saying he made high government policy off the top of his head with quips, jibes and insults. All this was, he said, taken down from press conferences by ambassadors and reported. "In the short space of a few months, he had destroyed years and years of effort of building up friendly relationships that have been of great value to New Zealand, not just in defence but in trade and in every other form of relationship."

Mr Lange later responded by recalling statements by Sir Robert when he was Prime Minister. Sir Robert, he said, had called President Carter a peanut farmer, had said Zimbabawe's Robert Mugabe had come out of the jungle, and said he would make Japan come kicking and screaming into the twentieth century.

CSO: 5200/4357

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

### NEW ZEALAND LEADER ON PALMER'S MEETINGS IN U.S.

HK231132 Hong Kong AFP in English 1058 GMT 23 Sep 85

[Text] Wellington, Sept 23 (AFP) — New Zealand and the United States have established "an agreement for a need to prevent further deterioration in our relationship," Prime Minister David Lange said today.

Speaking after being briefed on three days of meetings between Deputy Prime Minister Geoffrey Palmer and leading Reagan administration officials in Washington, Mr Lange said he hoped the agreement would "form the basis for strengthening our relationship." His comments came as a surprise to reporters who earlier had been told the United States had rejected New Zealand's latest proposals for solving the ANZUS nuclear warships ports ban row. But Mr. Lange was adamant the "frank" Washington talks had helped produce a new working relationship with the United States.

"There was no desire on the part of the United States to have deteriorating relations with New Zealand," he said. After the first day of talks in Washington, he said, Mr. Palmer had "met with a fairly monolithic administration response" to the plan for New Zealand to assess for itself whether U.S. ships carried nuclear arms.

Administration officials had taken exception to "the categorisation of being inflexible" by Mr. Palmer at the end of that first day, he said, adding that there were then assurances that the United States was not inflexible. The U.S. warship USS Buchanan was banned from a New Zealand port early this year after Washington maintained its policy of not revealing whether its warships are nuclear armed or powered. The move sparked strong retaliation by the United States, which cut military cooperation with New Zealand and shelved the ANZUS alliance linking the two countries and Australia.

"What I am telling you is that the United States' relationship with New Zealand has gone on for one and a half centuries and they (the United States) are not going to blow it now," Mr. Lange said. He said the American decision that they would review the ANZUS alliance if nuclear warships' port access was not restored "will only be in New Zealand's interests if they do so."

The review was "not about" notice to withdraw from ANZUS but was designed to make "the arrangements more effective between the three partners while preserving the alliance." He said the United States had not rejected outright a New Zealand proposal for a non-nuclear U.S. warship to visit New Zealand.

"New Zealand went with a very genuine proposition to the U.S., which proposition is still being considered," he said, adding "it is not a closed door." The Washington talks had also "made it abundantly clear to the U.S. where we stand," he said. "They were to that extent very constructive. The extent of this government's commitment to the anti-nuclear (policy) is now known. We have been tested on our commitments to (anti-nuclear) law quite properly by the United States and remained throughout that process committed to it," he said.

## **NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS**

### **NEW ZEALAND PARLIAMENT DEBATES ANTINUCLEAR BILL**

HK250511 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 19 Sep 85 p 5

[By political reporter Debra Sturm]

[Text] An attempt by New Zealand Democratic Party MP Mr Garry Knapp to introduce anti-nuclear legislation last night was described by the Government as "xerox politics" and nothing more than a publicity exercise for the members. But the Government said it would allow the Nuclear Free New Zealand private members bill to be introduced and passed on to the disarmament and arms control select committee for consideration. This was because the Government was "generally sympathetic" with the intentions of the bill, said Defence Minister Mr Frank O'Flynn.

The bill is, in fact, the same legislation introduced last year by the MP for Auckland Central, now senior cabinet minister Mr Prebble, when he was in Opposition.

Mr Knapp said in his speech last night that, in his opinion, the Prebble bill precipitated the snap election. The bill seeks to prohibit nuclear devices, nuclear weapons and nuclear waste within New Zealand, making this the first sovereign nation to be completely nuclear-free by law.

Mr Knapp said he was bringing the legislation back to the house -- after apparently languishing at the bottom of the Labour Government's list of legislative measures -- to "keep the Government honest." "Fourteen months after the election, we are still waiting for the long-promised legislation."

"There is a great deal of doubt in the minds of the New Zealand public as to the resolve of this Government to proceed on this issue," said Mr Knapp. This made for important legislation to come into the house now, along with the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Palmer, was in Washington seeking advice on similar legislation.

"Nobody believes the nonsense argument that has been suggested that the Government has not been able to draft its own legislation. The public won't buy it," said Mr Knapp.

"The Prime Minister (Mr Lange) is playing footsies with the Pentagon. He is kicking for touch because pressure is being applied."

Mr Knapp said New Zealanders wanted the Government to "get on with it."

Mr Prebble questioned the wisdom of introducing a bill more than a year after it was originally drafted. Mr Knapp was engaging in "xerox politics," he said.



"He has got hold of a xerox machine and paid no thought at all to the last 13 months. There is no acknowledgment that, since the Labour Government has come into power, not one nuclear weapon has been introduced into New Zealand," he said. The bill also did not take into account the recently formulated South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty.

Mr Prebble also strongly criticized the Leader of the Opposition, Mr McLay, who is overseas, for his public comments on the issue while away. He had not followed the age-old convention of being "loyal opposition," said Mr Prebble.

Mr Frank O'Flynn said the government would support the legislation through its introduction and its referral to a select committee. He like Mr Prebble, said, however, that Mr Knapp's move was little more than publicity exercise. It was a kind of "legislative plagiarism" that cast doubt on the sincerity of the member.

The Opposition spokesman on disarmament, Mr Doug Graham, said it was well known there was very little risk from nuclear ships that might come into a port.

The legislation would achieve nothing. It would not achieve disarmament or arms control; it would not relieve tension between the Soviet Union and the United States; and would not dissuade the French from their testing.

"It will lead to the end of ANZUS, which 70 percent of all New Zealanders want for conventional purpose," said Mr Graham. "It will lead to instability in the Pacific region."

"It will be totally counterproductive to the goal of peace," he said.

Opposition defence spokesman Mr Doug Kidd reiterated that the National Party, if returned to power, would recommit New Zealand to full commitment to the Western alliance and ANZUS, if it could be revived.

Government MP for Mt Albert Ms Helen Clark said New Zealanders would be disappointed with the National Party's stand in opposing the bill last night. New Zealanders wanted a ban on nuclear weapons, she said.

The debate was interrupted by the adjournment at 11 pm. There will be about 30 more minutes of speeches before the bill is voted on, probably next Wednesday.

CSO: 5200/4357

## NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS: AUSTRALIA SEES MITTERRAND MURUROA VISIT AS 'PROVOCATIVE'

### Foreign Minister Cited

LD121112 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 12 Sep 85

[Text] Canberra, September 12 TASS — Australian Foreign Minister William Hayden has described as "provocative" the forthcoming visit by French President Francois Mitterrand to Mururoa Atoll. Speaking in Parliament the minister stressed that the planned trip testifies to France's intention to demonstrate its determination to go ahead with its nuclear tests in the South Pacific. In all, France has staged there over a hundred nuclear explosions over the last twenty years, and it stubbornly refuses to discontinue its test programme despite persistent protests from the governments and peoples of the region.

The foreign minister said that this visit will be regarded as extremely provocative by the South Pacific countries which are strongly opposed to the continuation of tests. William Hayden said that Australia's objections to the continuation of tests, voiced over more than ten years, constitute the firm position of the present government, too. The French, he said, can well test nuclear weapons in their own territory.

### New Zealand's Lange Comments

LD121641 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 12 Sep 85

[Text] Canberra, September 12 TASS — New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange has made a statement in Wellington in connection with a visit by French President Francois Mitterrand tomorrow to the Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific, a French nuclear testing centre. The New Zealand prime minister pointed out, in particular, that the visit could only step up regional resistance to French nuclear testing. In the view of the New Zealand head of government, the only result of Francois Mitterrand's tour of southern Pacific countries could be an objective briefing of the president by French diplomatic officers posted there about the strength of the regional sentiments against French policy.

CSO: 5200/1011

GENERAL

USSR'S SHEVARNADZE ADDRESSES UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

LD241800 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 24 Sep 85

[Excerpts] New York, September 24 TASS — Eduard A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister for foreign affairs of the USSR, made a statement today at the plenary meeting of the 40th session of the General Assembly on the United Nations. He said:

Mr. President,

Distinguished delegates

Four decades separate us from the victory of the freedom-loving peoples over German fascism and Japanese militarism, from the end of the Second World War. The United Nations, whose birth was a natural result of that great victory and on whose activities the peoples have largely pinned their hopes for preventing new wars, has now been in existence for forty years.

Today it can be stated with great satisfaction that those have been forty years without world wars. Truly gigantic changes have taken place in the world over that period.

They include the establishment and development of the world socialist system — a system of states whose socio-political nature rules out any interest in wars. All practical activities by the countries of the socialist community on the international arena are based on the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The role of socialism in world affairs has been steadily increasing.

Over an extremely short historical span of time the hurricane of the peoples' liberation struggle has destroyed and eliminated from the face of the colonial system of imperialism. Over one hundred new states have emerged from its ruins. Today they are full-fledged members of the United Nations.

The forces that work to strengthen peace and prevent war are constantly growing. At present, their struggle involves people on all continents, of all generations and occupations, and with most diverse political beliefs.

The past forty years have been a period of rapid progress of the scientific and technological revolution, which is not only drastically changing our concepts of the structure of the universe and of the matter but is also creating ever broader opportunities to meet the spiritual and material needs of every individual and of all mankind. Already today, scientific achievements, if they are used for constructive purposes, permit to resolve just about any economic problem. Yet, they also generate unprecedented risks whenever they are used for developing means of annihilation and destruction.

In the complex and rapidly changing world, which witnesses a continued struggle between the forces of progress and those of reaction, between the forces of the future and those of the past, the development of relations among states, including the major powers possessing the greatest military potential, has followed a variable and at times zigzag path.

Aggravations of international tension alternated with periods of its abatement; international crises sprang up and were overcome, with some of them being so acute as to bring mankind to the verge of catastrophe. It would be fair to say that many a time when the international barometer forecast a storm, the United Nations raised its voice in warning and was also able to take practical steps to reduce the threat.

The greatest hopes for a stable peace emerged in the 1970's which went down in history as the years of detente. The latter was based on the general recognition that it was inadmissible in the nuclear age to seek to attain political and ideological goals by means of war and that the policy aimed at achieving military superiority of some states over others, of one social system over the other was illegitimate and dangerous.

The countries of the socialist community and many other states have every right to take pride in being the architects and engineers of detente.

Yet, in the late 1970's and early 1980's the world once again saw a higher pitch of activity of the forces which never supported the policy of detente and are now seeking to undo its most important accomplishments. As a result, much in the system of international relations has come out of joint and the risk of war has sharply increased.

Our delegation intends to set forth the considerations of the Soviet Union regarding the reasons for the current unfavourable development of the situation in the world and the ways to remedy the existing state of affairs. It can be remedied only if there is an understanding, as has been pointed out by Mikhail S. Gorbachev, of the "realities and those dangers which we will inevitably face tomorrow if today those who can and must take the only correct decision evade the responsibility incumbent on them."

We perceive the greatest peril in the fact that the nuclear arms race has taken, so to say, a fresh start and is forging ahead. Added to this is the threat of the arms race spreading to outer space. The possibility of the arms race acquiring an uncontrollable and irreversible character is becoming real. In the final analysis, this is a road leading to a nuclear catastrophe.

It is also alarming that of late it has not been possible to settle a single regional conflict or to extinguish a single hotbed of military tension. In the meantime, the flames of "local" wars, more often than not undeclared, have been killing dozens and hundreds of thousands of people.

Mankind is suffering because of being denied the opportunity to tackle urgent problems such as food, ecology, energy, population, and the constantly widening gap between the developed and developing countries in terms of their economic level. It has been denied that opportunity because the intellectual and material resources needed to find a radical solution to these problems common to all mankind are being squandered on the arms race.

Not a single twist in the arms race spiral was initiated by the Soviet Union. It is only in response to actions of the other side and out of legitimate concern for our own security and that of our allies and friends, concern for international security as a whole, that we have developed or are developing this or that weapon system.



Moreover, as early as 1946 the USSR proposed that nuclear weapons should be banned for all time. We have been advocating this ever since, and this remains our position now. We have been proposing that agreement should be reached on renouncing all weapons of mass destruction, reducing and totally eliminating their existing stockpiles, and cutting down armed forces and conventional armaments. Our country has come out with a proposal on the general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

These radical proposals have yet to be implemented, and it is the United States and some other NATO countries, rather than the Soviet Union, that are to blame for this fact.

It is precisely because of their refusal to follow the example of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, which has also unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that the threat of nuclear war continues to hang over the world.

Nonetheless, due to the vigorous efforts of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states a number of treaties and agreements limiting the arms race in major areas have been concluded. These are the 1963 Moscow treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the 1968 treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems and the SALT I agreement, signed in 1972, and the 1979 SALT II treaty. All these treaties, which have served in large measure to reinforce strategic stability, became possible because political realism was also displayed by the then leaders of the United States and other Western countries.

It is not the fault of the Soviet Union that local conflicts break out and are raging in various regions of the world. The only thing that we could be "guilty" of is that we have invariably been and remain on the side of the peoples threatened by imperialism and of the states upon whose sovereignty and generally recognized rights imperialism is encroaching.

As regards the increasingly acute economic problems common to all mankind, the Soviet Union has consistently been in favour of uniting the efforts of all states and peoples with a view to finding a rational solution to those problems. This is the thrust of the proposals made by our country, by all Warsaw Treaty member countries, for a drastic reduction in the military expenditures of states, and above all of the major powers.

These are all facts which cannot be disputed.

The responsibility for the current critical state of international relations rests with another group of countries, namely the United States and some of its closest allies.

It was they who, in the early 1980s, wrecked the structure of negotiations which had taken such an effort to build, the negotiations which had shown signs of progress toward agreements in many areas ranging from complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests to the limitation of sales and supplies of conventional armaments, from banning the development of anti-satellite systems to limiting [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1755 GMT on 24 September 1985 carries Shevardnadze's speech. At this point, TASS Russian says "reducing" instead of "limiting."] military activities in the Indian Ocean. It was the United States that refused to ratify the SALT II treaty designed to pave the way to further, ever more substantial cuts in strategic arms. It was the United States that in 1983 torpedoed the Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe by starting the deployment of its new nuclear missiles on the European Continent.

And the new military programmes which now cover not only the land, oceans and atmosphere of our planet but also outer space are U.S. programmes too.

No particular perspicacity is needed to see clearly that precisely those states that are obstructing disarmament efforts are also set on fomenting local conflicts.

They bear responsibility for the failure thus far to come to grips with problems common to all mankind.

All of this is being said not for the sake of polemics but in order that the United Nations could, on the basis of real facts and through concerted efforts, devise effective ways of radically improving international relations and strengthening universal security.

It is said at times that all that is needed is that the "two superpowers" should stop competing with each other for influence in the world. This proposition stems either from ignorance or from malicious intent. First, the Soviet Union has no intention of placing itself above other states and peoples, nor is it seeking opportunities to order them about or dictate its will to them. Secondly, the Soviet Union is not involved in any competition whatsoever, whether for markets, natural resources, control over sea or air routes, or the possession of outer space.

On the other hand, it is of course true that the Soviet Union is one of the world's two most powerful nations. But the whole point is what political aims are served by that power. Those who invoke the concept of the "two superpowers" would be well advised to ponder once in a while what would happen to their independence and what turn world developments would generally take if the USSR were weaker than it is and if the Soviet people were not investing so much of their effort, material resources and scientific endeavour in maintaining its economic and military potential at an adequate level.

In discussions about the ways of improving the situation frequent mention is also made of the need to restore, above all, confidence among states. This, it is said, would make it possible to resolve all major problems, including those of halting the arms race and settling regional conflicts. Indeed, confidence is an important factor in overcoming the current difficulties. We feel, however, that it is impossible to achieve a necessary and reliable degree of trust in relations among states unless the causes and the material roots of distrust are removed.

But work to restore confidence must be pursued, and this is what we are doing. In particular, at the Stockholm conference of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Soviet Union is working for the adoption of a complex of large-scale political and effective military-technical confidence-building measures. At Stockholm we are prepared to proceed immediately, together with our negotiating partners, to the actual drafting of agreements to that effect. Our country attaches major importance to the CSCE process as a whole.

The Soviet Union is building and developing its relations with all states in strict compliance with the Final Act and on the basis of the 10 principles proclaimed therein, attaching special importance to the factor of confidence in those relations. And it is gratified when it sees this factor present in its relations with this or that country in Europe, America, Asia, Africa, Oceania.

In our relations with other states, we have invariably given priority to the search for ways of easing international tensions and preventing the danger of war. Of major importance in this context is Mikhail S. Gorbachev's coming visit to France.

We also want to build normal, stable relations with the United States. We have never been the initiators of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States. Today, we do not think that tensions in Soviet-American relations result from a fated clash of national interests. We believe, therefore, that both sides should be interested in a successful outcome of the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. This is precisely how the Soviet Union approaches the meeting. It remains to be seen what will be the attitude of the other side in this matter.

We are convinced that the Soviet-American summit meeting should focus on the most important problem of today -- the problem whose solution would indeed make it possible to reduce decisively the danger of war, restore international trust and create prerequisites for resolving many other pressing issues in relations among states.

What I have in mind is the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms and enhancing strategic stability. Let me address this question in greater detail.

To begin with, it appears indisputable that as long as states possess nuclear arms the risk of outbreak of nuclear war cannot be completely ruled out. It is equally true, however, that in conditions of strategic equilibrium that risk is comparatively lower. For, essentially, strategic equilibrium means that each side, even if it becomes victim of a nuclear aggression committed by the other side, would still retain sufficient strategic capability to deliver a no less devastating blow against the aggressor. Consequently, in conditions of strategic equilibrium there can be no winner in a nuclear war, and starting it would be tantamount to committing suicide.

Yet the situation may change if one side should try to acquire such a nuclear potential as would enable it to hope in one strike to deprive the other side of adequate retaliatory capability against aggression and even more so if the potential aggressor should develop a space-based anti-missile shield, hoping to protect itself with it from a retaliatory strike. It is obvious that in such case the aggressor may be tempted to deliver or threaten to deliver a first "disarming" nuclear strike, counting on impunity. This is what makes the desire to gain military superiority in the nuclear age extremely dangerous. Yet, this is precisely the thrust of the new U.S. military programmes, already under way or about to be launched.

It could be argued that this is a purely hypothetical danger since the Soviet Union itself has repeatedly stated that it would not allow the other side to obtain superiority and would take appropriate countermeasures to restore the balance. But does that mean that the problem of removing the danger of nuclear war will no longer be on the agenda?

True, our country will not permit military superiority over itself. The state and party leadership of the Soviet Union has instructed me to reaffirm this once again from the high rostrum of the United Nations. Profoundly mistaken are those who may expect that the Soviet economy will fail to withstand the strain of a qualitatively new stage in the arms race which is currently being forced upon us. Our country and the Soviet economy have had to stand up to even greater pressures. Today, the economic might of the Soviet



state and its scientific and technological potential are such as to leave no doubt whatsoever in anyone's mind concerning the ability and determination of our people to deal with the new challenge.

But it should be remembered that the higher the level of military confrontation in this nuclear-and-space age, the more shaky and less secure — even if strategic equilibrium is maintained — become the foundations of world peace. Nuclear war in these conditions may result not only from a deliberate decision but also from attempts at blackmail or miscalculation by one side as to the intentions or actions of the other; it may also break out as a consequence of someone's reckless behaviour prompted by a sudden aggravation of the situation or be caused by malfunctions in computers which are increasingly relied upon in the operation of modern sophisticated weapon systems.

Such is our understanding of the current strategic and political realities. It is based on grim facts that cannot be ignored.

It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union has been so persistent in seeking not merely the maintenance, but a lowering of the existing level of strategic equilibrium, the early adoption of effective measures to stop and reverse the arms race. We know — and many other states now realize this as well — that there is no more time to waste, for it may become too late.

We have gathered in New York in the final days of the first month of autumn. This season is regarded as a time to harvest the crop, when farmers look to the coming winter with a feeling of work well done.

When one thinks about this, another metaphor comes to mind which, regrettably, has already taken root in the vocabulary of mankind — the metaphor of "nuclear winter". We want the word "winter" to retain in all languages of the world the one and only meaning — its original one — and be identified solely with the season of the year which is beautiful and joyful in its own way.

Seeking to establish a favourable climate for the resumption of the process of arms limitation and reduction and ultimately for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere, the Soviet Union has recently taken substantial steps on a unilateral basis.

They include the decision not to place anti-satellite weapons in outer space so long as the United States does not take such a step. Unfortunately, however, the United States, in disregard of the interests of political and military stability, has recently tested an anti-satellite weapon against a target in space.

Among our steps is also the suspension of further implementation of our countermeasures in Europe caused by the deployment U.S. medium-range nuclear systems on the territories of some West European countries.

And finally, there is our moratorium on any nuclear explosions.

It is clear that by their very nature such unilateral steps could not be taken as measures of unlimited duration. But they could become of unlimited duration if the United States followed our good example. And that would constitute significant progress towards a relaxation of military tensions in the world. If, however, the United States fails to heed the voice of reason, let no one blame us when the unilateral moratoria we have declared are ended as they expire. It is not for us but for the United States to make the choice.



Notwithstanding the importance of such steps as moratoria designed to put a brake on the arms race, the peoples of the world have every right to demand that radical measures be taken to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear -- and not only nuclear -- weapons.

From the very beginning of the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space arms, our country has been determined to achieve a radical solution to these interrelated problems and has taken a constructive stand. The Soviet delegation has brought to the current round of the negotiations substantial, large-scale and far-reaching proposals.

We believe that agreement to ban space strike weapons and to effect truly radical reductions in nuclear arms would today have the most positive effect. Such an agreement can bring about a turn for the better in the entire course of world events, avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe and open up for the peoples the prospect of a world free from fear for tomorrow. Mankind would march towards the new millennium, which is already knocking at our doors, confident that civilization would continue to progress.

The Soviet Union has been putting forward proposals on the whole range of issues regarding the cessation of the arms race.

I am not going to name each of those proposals, for all of them will in one way or another become the subject of an exchange of views at the General Assembly. Let me just say that they cover the nuclear field, including the cessation of nuclear tests, as well as chemical weapons, conventional weapons, and the numerical strength of armed forces. In some cases it is a question of a freeze; in others, of a reduction. As before, the Soviet Union resolutely supports the proposals to establish nuclear-free zones, zones free from chemical weapons, and zones of peace in various regions. It favours a limitation of naval activities and naval armaments and resolutely opposes the development of any new weapons of mass destruction.

In the context of the proposed arms limitation and reduction measures the Soviet Union believes it necessary to provide for adequate measures of verification, national in some cases, or national in combination with international, whenever there is an objective necessity for this. We have as great an interest as anyone else in effective verification of compliance by all states with their obligations regarding measures of disarmament.

We call upon the states represented at the United Nations General Assembly, members of politico-military alliances as well as non-aligned and neutral countries, to support this approach which, we are convinced, is constructive and also realistic.

I wish once again to draw your attention to a problem whose solution will to a large extent shape the world of our children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. I am referring to the problem of the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Space, until recently the realm of science fiction writers, has now become an area of man's practical activity. Peaceful exploration of space holds out for mankind truly limitless prospects of utilizing scientific and technological achievements to promote the economic and social progress of the peoples and to solve the vast problems that face mankind on earth.

However, these truly cosmic dimensions -- and I am not speaking figuratively -- also present new requirements to the inhabitants of the earth and above all to the leaders of states.

There should be no repetition of the mistake made four decades ago when the state and peoples of the world were unable to prevent the great intellectual achievement of the mid-twentieth century -- the release of the energy of the atom -- from becoming a means for the mass annihilation of human beings. This folly should not happen again at the end of this century when, having filled the first pages of its space history, mankind is facing a choice -- either space will help to improve the living conditions on our planet or it will become the source of a new mortal danger.

Wishing to contribute to mankind's progress towards new heights of civilization, our country has taken a new major initiative by proposing the inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly of an item "international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of its non-militarisation."

The Soviet Union has also submitted to the General Assembly specific proposals concerning the main directions and principles of broad international cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Outer space is indivisible and all states should be able to take part in its peaceful exploration.

This implies that progress should be made by joint efforts in both basic and applied areas of space exploration and that all the peoples should be able to benefit from space research. It is our view that such cooperation could best be carried out within the framework of a world space organization. But this could become a reality provided that all channels for militarizing the boundless reaches of outer space are closed off.

To counter the sinister plans of "star wars", the USSR is putting before the international community a concept of "star peace."

The Soviet Union hopes that its proposals will be examined carefully by the General Assembly.

Mr President, distinguished colleagues,

The Soviet delegation has set forth the views and proposals of the Soviet Union which we have found necessary and timely to submit for the consideration of the United Nations. It is to be hoped that they will be regarded with understanding by all states represented in this hall and by all peoples who constitute mankind as a whole.

A great deal of useful work for the benefit of peace and international cooperation has been done by the United Nations in the past forty years. However, the United Nations has still a lot more to accomplish, since it appears that we are entering upon a most crucial period in the history of mankind when it will have to take a decision on the question of paramount importance to it: whether to live in peace or perish in a nuclear war.

In this regard I would like to quote the following policy statement of Mikhail S. Gorbachev: "Our goal, as we see it, is to resolve together -- for no one is able to do it alone -- the major problems which are essentially common to us: how to prevent war, how to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament, how to settle the existing conflicts and crises and to prevent potential ones, how to create a world climate that would allow every country to focus attention and concentrate resources on finding solutions to its own problems (show me a country which has no problems), and how to join efforts in resolving global problems."

Thank you, Mr President.

CSO: 5200/1004

GENERAL

USSR: CRITICISM OF REAGAN SEPTEMBER PRESS CONFERENCE

Arms Imbalance 'Myths'

LD260854 Moscow TASS in English 0841 GMT 26 Sep 85

[TASS headline: "Reagan Keeps Rehashing the Same Old Tall Tales"]

[Text] Moscow, September 26 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes: Speaking at a news conference in Washington, U.S. President Ronald Reagan claimed once again that the United States was lagging militarily behind the Russians who, he alleged, enjoyed a three-to-one superiority in all categories of weapons.

Whenever he decides to talk about the military balance between the Soviet Union and the United States, however, his pronouncements leave his aides in a real quandary about how to respond to the ensuring ironic comments by American newsmen.

For he conjures his data about the USSR's "overwhelming military superiority" out of thin air, without being disconcerted at all by the fact that the rough parity existing between the U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces is something recognized even by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have repeatedly admitted it in their annual reports, including the one issued in February 1985.

While mounting another scare blitz over a "Soviet military threat", Reagan does not even bother to keep his own statements from being contradictory. When he wants to boast of his efforts to boost U.S. might, his conclusions about the balance of forces in the world then strike quite a different note from the "U.S. lag" claims. As recently as last year, for example, Reagan said in a minute of frankness, as he spoke to an American youth delegation, that the United States and the Soviet Union were almost equal in their strength.

Soon after taking the presidential office, he contended that the Soviet Union was actually ahead of the United States in all aspects of military power. After spending one trillion dollars on nuclear warfare preparations over the following five years, selfsame Reagan repeated that old claim of his once again in September 1985 when he said that his country was still far behind the Soviet Union in virtually all offensive arms, both nuclear and conventional.

But when he went so far as to allege that over his tenure the Soviet Union's margin of superiority in all kinds of weaponry had grown to three to one, American newsmen naturally demanded explanations. Where all the U.S. tax-payers' money had gone if the balance of forces had really become so threatening to the United States, they asked.

As she interviewed Robert McFarlane, the President's national security adviser, commentator Leslie Stoll of CBS television bluntly asked him if Reagan was to be believed at all when making public statements addressed to the whole world on the balance of armed forces between the USSR and the United States. McFarlane chose nothing better to reply than that what the President really had in mind were not all weapons categories but only systems designed to hit hardened targets. McFarlane did not care to explain what that exactly meant though.

So it is legitimate to ask why the President needed to twist the facts about the existing strategic military equilibrium between the Soviet Union and the United States so misshapenly.

The answer apparently is that the present U.S. Administration, which is trying to undercut agreements signed to reduce the nuclear war danger and chasing the illusory goal of military supremacy, does not have any real arguments to defend its militarist plans and so has to rely on floating fantastic myths about a "Soviet military threat" and "Soviet military superiority."

### 'Propagandistic Rivalry'

LD232301 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 23 Sep 85

[Text] President Ronald Reagan held a news conference at the White House recently. With reference to the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting he claimed that he treated it very seriously. At the same time he declared that research and tests in the framework of his Strategic Defense Initiative would not be subject to any agreements with the USSR. The President gave it to be understood that the United States would go on with the development of its space weaponry. Valdimir Bogachev elaborates:

The White House continues to view the process of limiting and reducing the weapons of mass destruction as a propagandistic rivalry in which the United States must be as adroit as possible in stinging the competitor. Currently Washington's concern is how to brainwash people and convince them of its peaceableness, not how to find a way to reverse the nuclear threat by joint efforts. This is a task very hard to accomplish because in the past few months the Reagan administration has taken not a single practical step that could be viewed as a gesture of goodwill. Washington's reaction to the Soviet freeze on the tests of antisatellite weapons, imposed 2 years ago, was to hit a target in space on 13 September with the help of its ASAT system.

When the Soviet Union stopped the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe the United States answered with siting additional cruise missiles in Belgium and other NATO countries. On 6 August the USSR imposed a moratorium on all its nuclear explosions and urged the United States to follow suit. Ten days later the United States conducted a test of nuclear arms. Even the head of the United States delegation to the arms control talks in Geneva, Max Kampelman, in a conversation with the American Secretary of State George Shultz, expressed anxiety over the Soviet Union's advantages in the eyes of public opinion.

Washington, with its claims that it highly values the opinion of the world public, could have reacted in the same spirit by stopping its nuclear tests. This kind of



competition between the USSR and the United States would pose an important step on the road of alleviating the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

Evidently the White House continues to base its understanding of what is advantageous and disadvantageous only on momentary considerations, on its plans for gaining military supremacy over the Soviet Union. With reference to the disquieting development of relations between the USSR and the United States, the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has said whether we like one another or not we can survive or perish only together. The basic question we must answer now is this: whether or not we are prepared to acknowledge at last that there is only one way out -- to live in peace with each other; whether or not we are prepared to rechannel our way of thinking and acting from the military to the peaceful vein.

CSO: 5200/1003

GENERAL

USSR: COMMENTARIES ON UPCOMING REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

U.S. Behavior 'Negative'

LD141631 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1315 GMT 14 Sep 85

[From the "International Review" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] There is little more than 2 months to go before the Geneva meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. There is great and worldwide interest in this forthcoming event. People hope that dialogue between the leaders of the two states will help to stop mankind's creep toward a nuclear conflict, and to improve the political situation on our planet. Interest in the projected meeting was enhanced in particular following the publication of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine and his conversation with American senators. This is evidenced by many statements, commentaries, and analytical articles dealing with the state of Soviet-American relations.

Comrade Gorbachev's replies demonstrated the principled, bold, and constructive approach of the Soviet Union toward solving the acute problems of today. It seems that this gave the White House something of a fright and caused discord in official Washington circles. For, as THE NEW YORK TIMES comments, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's remarks define him as a man thirsting to put an end to the arms race and to get on to resolving the most vital problems of peace.

At the same time, the newspaper goes on, President Reagan's conduct is in clear contrast to this. It gives the impression that the head of the White House intends to continue stepping up American weapons and does not want to take even a minimum step which might lead to agreement at the meeting with the Soviet leader.

In an evident attempt to alter this growing impression, the White House has declared that the U.S. President is serious in his approach to the issue of relations with the Soviet Union, and that there are no reasons why some degree of success should not be achieved in Geneva if both sides approach the meeting constructively. The White House asserted that the United States intends to approach the meeting in just such a manner.

Unfortunately, this assertion is not backed up either by Washington's practical deeds, or by statements by its leading officials. The United States has so far rejected all Soviet peace initiatives. Our country's introduction of a moratorium on underground nuclear explosions met with a demonstrative response from the United States -- another nuclear test. The United States rejected our initiative for establishing in central

8 October 1985

Europe a zone free of chemical weapons. And in response to the USSR's proposal for peaceful cooperation in space, under conditions of nonmilitarization of space, the United States carries out a military test of the ASAT antisatellite system against a real target in space. This took place yesterday. Here you can see a mock-up. [video shows satellite mock-up in space] Yesterday, a two-stage missile was launched from an F-15 fighter, which hit the satellite. [video shows F-15 taking off]

This dangerous step caused dissatisfaction among broad circles of the American public. Many prominent U.S. politicians spoke out against it. They underlined that testing an antisatellite weapon would create serious difficulties both for the Geneva negotiations on nuclear space weapons and for the projected summit meeting.

It would stimulate a new and dangerous spiral in the arms race, since it leads to the deployment of a new class of weapon: space strike means. Ninety-eight U.S. congressmen sent a letter to the President calling for the test to be called off. But the White House remained deaf to this call.

One cannot but point out yet another negative aspect of the Washington administration's behavior. It is obvious that for a summit-level dialogue to be conducted successfully, the appropriate atmosphere must be created. Yet American officials are constantly coming out with crude anti-Soviet attacks; and what is more, both the U.S. Vice President and even the President himself joined in this campaign. In his last interview for the American college radio network, he tried to depict the Soviet Union as an extremely aggressive country, and deliberately distorted our policy.

Such statements are clearly at variance with the White House chief's assertions about being ready to make a constructive approach to the forthcoming summit meeting. The question arises: Does Washington really want this dialogue to be held? In any event, the United States is clearly trying to pick up points, as the saying goes, before the summit meeting, reducing the matter to a sort of combat between political super-gladiators, and thinking only of how to vanquish the opponent more adroitly.

Our position is quite different. We expect from the forthcoming meeting realistic, specific decisions aimed at halting the arms race and turning Soviet-American relations into a normal channel. It is for the sake of these goals that our country indeed intends to take part in the Geneva summit meeting.

#### Western Public Opinion

PM161321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 85 First Edition pp 4-5

[Article by political observer Yuriy Zhukov: "USSR-United States: On the Path to Summit Meeting"--uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] SLIGHTLY MORE THAN 2 MONTHS REMAIN UNTIL THE SOVIET-U.S. SUMMIT MEETING WHICH, ACCORDING TO THE AGREEMENT WHICH HAS BEEN REACHED, WILL BE HELD IN GENEVA 19-20 NOVEMBER. THE NEWS OF THIS AGREEMENT WAS WELCOMED WITH APPROVAL IN ALL COUNTRIES. PEOPLE LINK THEIR HOPES FOR PEACE AND A SECURE AND TRANQUIL LIFE WITH IT.

NATURALLY, RULING CIRCLES OF MANY COUNTRIES, POLITICIANS, AND THE BROAD PEOPLE'S MASSES ARE DISPLAYING A VERY LIVELY INTEREST IN HOW PREPARATION FOR THIS MEETING IS DEVELOPING, HOW THE ATMOSPHERE AROUND THE FORTHCOMING TALKS IS TAKING SHAPE, AND WHAT CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ARE BEING PUT FORWARD BY THEIR FUTURE PARTICIPANTS.

## Businesslike Talk Is Needed

The answers given by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to TIME magazine and his statements in his talk with a group of U.S. senators are now the focus of universal attention. The newspapers have already published a large number of foreign comments and there is scarcely any need to analyze the main features of these comments.

The reports coming in from all corners of the planet attest that, almost everywhere, statesmen and politicians and the broadest public circles welcome the Soviet Union's bold new initiatives. They approve of the constructive approach toward the forthcoming meeting formulated by the Soviet leader. The summit meeting is designed for serious negotiations and not for "getting acquainted," as Washington puts it. Its aim is to find, despite the differences, points of contact and areas of common or parallel interests and to conduct an honest, unbiased talk pervaded by the desire to find a way back from the edge of the nuclear abyss and to overcome the present negative period in relations between the USSR and the United States.

Hence, the just conclusion is drawn that the Soviet Union is preparing exceptionally seriously and painstakingly for the forthcoming summit meeting and already has a firm platform for discussion. The USSR's decision on a moratorium on any nuclear explosions, the proposal at the United Nations of the new initiative on the peaceful use of space, and M.S. Gorbachev's statement that the Soviet Union will be ready to make radical nuclear arms reduction proposals if the United States abandons its plans to militarize space are assessed everywhere as confirmation of this.

The fact that the Soviet stance on all these complex problems was set forth in a businesslike, balanced, and, at the same time, firm tone is making a very great impression on the public in the United States and in other countries. This has, to a considerable extent, ensured a broad response to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's answers to TIME magazine. People everywhere understand that this line has been dictated by the Soviet side's sincere desire to "go its half of the way" in improving relations with the United States if, of course, the other side does the same.

On the other hand, there are growing fears everywhere provoked by the negative and sometimes provocative stance taken by the U.S. Administration, which is continuing to reject out of hand any Soviet proposals, repeatedly declaring them to be "propaganda" and not even troubling to study them. At the same time, Washington is also taking practical steps which are provoking the arms race and leading to the fueling of tension in Soviet-U.S. relations. Thus, despite attempts to oppose it made even by some members of the House of Representatives, the United States recently carried out a test of the ASAT aircraft and missile antisatellite complex against a target in space, for which a real spaceship was used. It is not surprising, therefore, that many West Europeans, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "are continuing to treat Reagan as a trigger-happy cowboy. They are impressed by the Soviet leader, who is not allowing the Americans to order him about."

In this situation even NATO circles do not consider it possible to join openly with the negative stance taken by Washington on the threshold of the summit meeting and prefer to keep quiet. They are thereby causing considerable irritation to the Pentagon, whose chief, Weinberger, hastened to declare the new Soviet initiatives, including the moratorium on any nuclear explosions, "unfeasible" and demanded that the allies undertake a new intensification of the arms race on all salients.



Nonetheless, even in Bonn, where Washington's obedient comrades in arms are now in power, a spokesman for the FRG Government has stated that Federal Chancellor H. Kohl is expressing the hope that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will be crowned by an accord, particularly on arms control issues. (Not a bad wish, but of course it would be even better if the FRG exerted real, positive influence on its transatlantic ally to ensure the forthcoming meeting's success).

#### Important Task for the Public

You cannot fail to note one further factor. Whereas, until recently, the efforts of the organizers of "psychological warfare" in the West had widely disseminated the utterly false concept of the "equal responsibility" of the United States and the USSR for the arms race and for international tension, the present Soviet initiatives are uprooting this concept.

I shall cite the following example. On 3-4 September an international conference of public forces was held in Geneva, convened at the initiative of the influential U.S. movement to freeze nuclear arms. About 200 representatives of antiwar organizations from the United States, Canada, the FRG, Britain, France, Norway, Switzerland, Japan, and other countries gathered there.

Representatives of the USSR and U.S. delegations taking part in the current interstate conference on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons held in Geneva were invited to this meeting. And what happened? The speech by the Soviet representative, who described the new Soviet initiatives, was welcomed with approval. But the conference participants hissed the U.S. delegate who tried to justify the United States' negative attitude toward these initiatives. Shouts came from the auditorium: "Shame on the United States!", "The Russians are offering to do business, but the Americans are offering empty words!"

It is characteristic that the bourgeois press has kept totally quiet about this event. After all, the conference's organizers and participants could in no way be accused of being Soviet stooges -- they were representatives of the most eminent Western pacific organizations. The speakers there included U.S. Senator J. Kerry; (S. Maclean), a representative of the British "Scientists for Peace" movement; (K. Kheyns), a representative of the international antinuclear movement Greenpeace; Bruce Kent, a representative of Britain's Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; and others.

Those taking part in the meeting unanimously adopted an appeal to the United States and Britain "to respond positively to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, which in that case would become indefinite" and to conclude with the USSR a treaty on banning nuclear tests in perpetuity.

Joan (Gryunebaum), chairman of the national council of the "Campaign for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze," stated this movement is now organizing the collection of signatures in the United States for an appeal to Congress demanding an end to appropriations for further nuclear testing. Volunteers are being sent to the region of underground explosions in Nevada, where they intend to set up protest pickets.

Finally, we cannot fail to note that over 130 of the most varied U.S. public organizations have already expressed support for the Soviet Union's new initiatives. Americans have obviously grown tired of the constant tension and are being literally deafened by the daily din of the mass media which predicts an allegedly inevitable military conflict.

And, when they hear a calm and confident voice from Moscow stating that there is no fatal inevitability of a confrontation and that all troubling questions must be resolved through negotiations, they naturally welcome that opportunity.

Where is Washington taking matters? How is the U.S. Administration taking account of these sentiments? With what political baggage will the U.S. President come to Geneva? These questions cannot fail to perturb the world public, especially since it has been familiarized with the USSR's constructive position.

The U.S. bourgeois press, which can in no way be accused of pro-Soviet bias, unanimously recognizes now that the U.S. Administration was caught unawares by the USSR's dynamic peace offensive. As NEWSWEEK writes, "Ronald Reagan and his aides have gotten bogged down in defense, belittling the importance of the Soviet initiative as 'propaganda ploys' but reluctant or unable to put forward serious proposals to counter them."

Initially the White House spokesmen refused to comment at all on M.S. Gorbachev's answers to TIME magazine claiming that they "did not have the full text" although it is reliably known that they did have it. Only on 3 September did they come out with the first elucidation of their position. They said that although the United States allegedly "treats seriously its relations with the Soviet Union and is prepared (?) to embark on compromises, it nonetheless does not intend to abandon the preparation of 'star wars.'"

Essentially this was a repetition of the old negative position: Whatever the Soviet Union may undertake, the United States will in any case create space strike weapons and antisatellite systems.

Of course, these commentaries generated numerous critical remarks among U.S. political circles and even in the press. But the U.S. Administration strenuously refuses to consider public opinion, which is demanding the opportunity that has now been opened to halt the dangerous arms race, ease international tension, and normalize Soviet-U.S. relations should be used.

In the past few days a new attempt has been made across the ocean to step up the pitch of anti-Soviet propaganda, which will inevitably entail a deterioration in the political atmosphere surrounding the forthcoming talks. This is being done for the blatant purpose of stifling the increasingly widespread interest in the country in the new Soviet initiatives and to dispel hopes for the success of the summit meeting. It is no accident that daily warnings are being issued so persistently there claiming that the participants in the meeting can only get to know each other and "work out the agenda" for a discussion of problems for forthcoming years and even decades.

It is no longer the advisers to the U.S. political leadership, as was previously the case, but the leaders themselves -- the defense secretary, the vice president, and, finally, the President himself -- who have now come to the fore in this negative propaganda activity.

They have brought down on their audience a murky flow of the most monstrous fabrications whose aim is always the same: to intimidate people with the alleged "Soviet threat," to present the Soviet system and Soviet domestic and foreign policy in a distorted form, and thus to vindicate their confrontationist approach toward Soviet-U.S. relations.

Soviet readers are already familiar, in particular, with the U.S. head of state's more than strange outburst -- that is the only way to describe it. Just think: The U.S. President allowed himself to ascribe to V.I. Lenin, the great founder of our state and the founder of the policy of peaceful coexistence, truly delirious statements of an aggressive nature thought up by those who would like at any price to complicate preparation for the Geneva meeting.

Even after that, Vice President G. Bush stated 11 September, with a serious expression: "We attach fundamental importance to persuading the USSR of the seriousness of our intentions regarding the summit meeting"! I think, however, that the U.S. President's above-mentioned outburst will merely intensify still further in West Europe and in the United States itself doubts as to the seriousness of the U.S. side's intentions.

#### Promoting Dialogue

The peoples display unflagging interest in the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States. They link with it their hopes for the beginning of a positive process in Soviet-U.S. relations which would have a beneficial effect on all international affairs. That is why, sane people say, we must not poison the atmosphere in which the preparation for the meeting is developing, but promote the normal, businesslike development of dialogue.

In this connection, among those political circles which are aware of the great importance of the forthcoming meeting there is a growing resolve to do everything to ensure its success; to rebuff the opponents of international cooperation who are having an adverse influence in Washington; and to thwart their attempts to impede businesslike work in Geneva, to emasculate its content, and to reduce the entire matter to measures of a purely protocol nature.

As for the Soviet Union, its position is crystal-clear. Our leadership proceeds from the premise that, as stated in the replies to TIME magazine, the USSR and the United States simply cannot allow themselves to bring matters to confrontation. The Soviet Union is profoundly convinced of the necessity and possibility of improving Soviet-U.S. relations. That is why it is displaying a responsible, businesslike approach toward the possibility of dialogue and talks, avoiding unnecessary rhetoric, and focusing efforts on serious preparation for the meeting.

It is also time that Washington, which is so fond of talking of pragmatism in international affairs, engaged in this businesslike preparation, especially because the U.S. Administration already has the specific proposals put forward by the Soviet Union, including the important initiatives in the field of disarmament which have been not only formulated but already implemented unilaterally.

'Common Efforts' Needed

PM260754 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 85 First Edition p 1

[Vladlen Kuznetsov "International Review": "Fall of Hopes"]

[Text] The year 1985 is entering the final straight. Its beginning was marked by the very promising Soviet-American accord on the start of talks in Geneva whose agreed objective is to prevent an arms race in space and end it on earth. Such a weighty and binding decision by the two most powerful states in the world aroused considerable hopes. Hopes that 1985 would be a breakthrough year, the starting point of a turn for the better in international relations and affairs.

As yet, this has not happened. The international horizon is still clouded. It is true that there have been breaks and gaps in the clouds. However, it has not been possible to surmount the bad political weather. Events have not occurred nor actions been taken through the combined efforts of East and West, capable of ending the protracted period of confrontation. But now the world is awaiting such events. Between 2 and 5 October M.S. Gorbachev is to pay an official visit to France, with which the Soviet Union is linked by traditional bonds of constructive political cooperation and partnership. The efforts of the two countries once helped to mold the policy of detente; it is natural to expect them to speak out in favor of continuing that course which justified the peoples' hopes. And on 19-20 November, the gaze of the international public will be riveted on Geneva, where M.S. Gorbachev is to meet with R. Reagan.

What a lot of time has already been wasted, time that could have been used to restore stability in the international arena, to revive detente, and to tame the arms race! And the more time that passes, the more difficult it will be to straighten the dangerously tilting axis of world politics. The struggle between the two trends in world politics, the trend toward the fueling of tension and the trend toward its alleviation, looks as though it has entered the decisive stage.

No matter how great the present tension may be, the political preconditions for overcoming it are ripening. People on the planet are increasingly aware of the perniciousness of confrontation, which is fraught with the threat of nuclear catastrophe. They are not only aware of it. Antinuclear, antimilitarist feeling is strengthening and intensifying. The pressure exerted by public opinion and united mass antiwar forces on governments, parliaments, and parties is mounting; even those who are accustomed to look only to the military-industrial complex and to ignore the people's will are having to reckon with this. Against the somber background of international tension millions of people on all continents can see the bright aspects of detente still more clearly and sharply.

How should governments and states behave under these conditions? One would think that the most natural and necessary thing was to show restraint. To do nothing that might provoke the other side to escalate hostility and escalate war preparations. The Soviet Union is acting in precisely this spirit. Evidence? There is plenty of it. Let us cite the three unilateral moratoriums, for instance.



Moscow has assumed voluntary commitments not to place antisatellite systems in orbit, not to deploy new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, and not to carry out any nuclear tests. And before these, there was the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons.

Is this not weighty evidence of moderation and self-restraint, of a desire to get along with the other side? Are all these not signals for reconciliation?

It is well-known that the most difficult area in relations between the states of East and West in the security sphere, which is linked with the generally recognized need to end the arms race or initially at least to limit it. You need only look at the course of the talks in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm, where so far it has simply been impossible to make substantial progress.

It is precisely here, in this area, that the USSR believes it is necessary to make the greatest possible efforts to secure military detente and real program in limiting and reducing armaments. A wide range of far-reaching measures aimed at curtailing every possible kind of armament -- nuclear, chemical, and conventional -- has been offered to the West. There are no types of weapons that the Soviet Union is not prepared to limit, reduce, and eliminate. It is precisely Moscow that has posed before the international community a question of fundamental, historic importance in all its magnitude -- the question of preventing the militarization of space. This problem crucial to all world development is being discussed at the talks with the United States in Geneva at the USSR's insistence. The Soviet Union has submitted for the consideration of the present 40th UN General Assembly session the question of "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of Its Nonmilitarization." It is our country that is advocating with the utmost persistence the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons.

Thus, seeking to lessen East-West military confrontation, Moscow has created sufficient opportunities for reaching mutually acceptable and effective accords in various spheres of military detente. However, there is no reciprocity in the West, especially in the United States and certain other NATO countries: They respond to restraint by showing a lack of restraint and to attempts to advance the talks by retarding them. The USSR ceases the further deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe; the United States continues the "export" of first-strike weapons to the continent. The USSR introduces a moratorium on any nuclear explosions; the United States continues the "export" of first-strike weapons to the continent. The USSR introduces a moratorium on any nuclear explosions; the United States responds with another test of lethal weapons. For over 2 years the USSR has been observing the commitment it unilaterally assumed not to place antisatellite systems in orbit; the United States, despite this, ostentatiously hits a target in space with such a system.

It is the same with everything. Whatever the USSR does for the sake of international security, whatever constructive ideas it puts forward, everything is called into question and defamed, everything is sabotaged and rejected.

The Soviet Union has also been the initiator in holding summit meetings between the leaders of Eastern and Western states with a view to overcoming the "time of troubles" in international relations. M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with F. Mitterrand and R. Reagan are called upon to continue an established practice in international relations that in the sixties and seventies helped to untie the tight knots of unsolved problems, to alleviate international tension, and to improve both bilateral relations and the general political atmosphere in the world arena. A particularly important point is that: At summit meetings it was possible to achieve weighty results in reducing military confrontation and limiting arms, especially nuclear arms.

And scarcely anyone would object to planning something for the future. But there are problems that require immediate solutions and they cannot be shelved. They must be solved today, for tomorrow or the day after it will be much more difficult to settle them. As the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee declared in his answers to TIME magazine, the Soviet Union is urging the United States to reach serious accords both on strategic nuclear weapons, on medium-range nuclear weapons, and on space problems.

In the opinion of President R. Reagan, the main aim of his talks with the Soviet leader is to lessen the tension in relations between Washington and Moscow. Is it possible to achieve that aim by means of acquaintance and an exchange of opinions or by means of plans for the future? Hardly. The lessening of tension is possible if Soviet-American relations are steered into a normal course and if honest and specific efforts are made to tackle disarmament in earnest and to attempt to stop the arms race. But it is precisely this -- the impression emerges -- that does not form part of Washington's concept of the summit. This concept does not envisage -- at any rate today -- reaching specific accords with the USSR on limiting the arms race. The remarks of representatives of the Washington administration leave no doubt that, as far as they are concerned, the main thing is the continued implementation of the "rearm America" program, not the reaching of a consensus with Moscow on the lessening of military confrontation.

The Soviet Union fully realizes that it will be very difficult to put international affairs in order, restore stability, and steer Soviet-American relations into a normal course. One-shot efforts are not enough. What will be needed here is painstaking, intensive work, the work of more than a day. What will be required is common efforts by states -- the states of all continents.

CSO: 5200/1003

GENERAL

JPRS-TAC-85-037  
8 October 1985

# MOSCOW WEEKLY TALK SHOW FOCUSES ON ARMS ISSUES

LD221731 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 Sep 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, deputy editor in chief of magazine MIROVA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNRADONYYE OTNOSHENIYA, and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, political observer for Central Television and All-Union Radio]

## UN General Assembly

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, comrades! The 40th jubilee session of the UN General Assembly began its work this week. Forty years ago when, as a result of the people's victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism, the United Nations was established, the foundations were laid for a new world community. Those foundations, as the UN Charter stresses, are the deliverance of present and future generations from the calamities of war. On his arrival in New York, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, who is heading the Soviet delegation at the current UN General Assembly session said that the UN jubilee is a good occasion to think about today and tomorrow, and that at this point one cannot avoid looking at yesterday also. And indeed, in 4 decades the number of UN members has more than trebled from 50 to 159. The agenda of the current session, too, includes about 150 issues covering the whole range of problems worrying mankind. First and foremost, of course, are the questions of strengthening peace and international security. Is that not so, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich?

[Lebedev] Yes, and you know in fact the very first few hours of the General Assembly session confirm the correctness of your conclusion. It is highly typical and symptomatic that a decision was passed unanimously supporting the proposal that the session's agenda includes our Soviet proposal on the question of international cooperation in the peaceful conquest and nonmilitarization of space. That proposal, I stress, received unanimous support, and reaction from various U.S. political circles to the start of the General Assembly session was also typical. For example, Senator Moynihan, a former U.S. representative to the United Nations, was indignant. He wrote in a U.S. newspaper that the members of this international organization are imbued with anti-Americanism. He said that 99 countries representing the nonaligned bloc maintain close links with the USSR. At the last General Assembly, he notes, according to State Department calculations, the nonaligned countries supported 83 percent of the resolutions that Moscow voted for, while simultaneously supporting only 13 resolutions voted for by the United States. The question is, who is to blame? The USSR? Shouldn't they rather look at themselves and analyze U.S. foreign policy whereupon it will become clear what direction the work of

the General Assembly sessions usually takes -- although naturally I should not like now to forecast what form the discussions will take during the current session.

#### Space Weapons

[Kolchanov] Over the last few years it has become common perhaps even fashionable, in the White House to take offense at people and at things. You have mentioned one thing that the Americans took offense to, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, and they are also greatly offended when they declare each time that our proposal for the nonmilitarization of space and the peaceful conquest of space is propaganda. But what we say about space and about the peaceful conquest of space is accompanied by concrete acts which support what we say. And if the Americans want to take offense, they should take offense at themselves. They often speak of their desire for the peaceful conquest of space, but how do they respond? They respond with a concrete program -- the ASAT program, for example -- to put antimissile weapons into space; and by hitting a specific target with one of the weapons.

[Zholkver] Incidentally, as far as the target is concerned, I saw an interesting remark by a U.S. scientist.

As we all know, during the testing of the ASAT antisatellite system, a missile destroyed a U.S. satellite. It turns out that this satellite, which was called "Solwind", has been in orbit for 6 years and provided quite important information for studying solar wind and other astrophysical data. Yet this was the satellite used as a target and destroyed, which incidentally, made the U.S. scientists dissatisfied. At the same time I would like to stress that the USSR, while submitting proposals for broad international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space, graphically confirms them with its practical action. I am thinking of the participation by cosmonauts from many countries, including France, in flights on Soviet space craft. I am also thinking of the major participation by the USSR in a gigantic space project such as the Vega project for studying Venus and Halley's comet. As you know, our space stations for studying Venus contain instruments manufactured in other countries, including among others France.

[Kolchanov] I even had occasion last year to talk to the chief of the French part of that project over in Toulouse. It was a very interesting conversation: There was a recognition of the importance of that project for the peaceful conquest of space, and stress was laid on the outstanding part played by the USSR in carrying out that project.

[Zholkver] And when there was that conference on the Vega project, our delegation -- a delegation of Soviet scientists headed by Academician Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute -- laid stress on the importance of the experiment, and pointed out that the next time that Halley's Comet comes close to the earth will be as soon as the year 2062. So evidently things should not be stopped: Research must be carried out now. That is just one example of the USSR's constructive position in the sphere of the peaceful conquest of space.

[Kolchanov] I think that the fact that world public opinion so widely supports the Soviet peace initiatives, particularly the project that we have just been speaking of -- a peaceful initiative for the conquest of space -- I think that Washington takes this into account, and they very often try to present their SDI program -- the Strategic Defense Initiative -- at any rate in this current stage, as a major research project from which mostly peaceful things should result, but perhaps some military, too. The stress



is laid on the scientific nature of the project, on its being some sort of fundamental research even. In actual fact this is just pure speculation. Some \$70 billion has been allocated to carry out this work, and this is more than quadruple the allocations for the program to create nuclear weapons -- the Manhattan Project -- and more than double the cost of the Apollo program which made provision to develop cosmonautics for whole decades to come right up to putting a man on the moon. It is clear that in this instance it is a matter of implementing that research in the military sphere, of creating precisely military facilities and, specifically, space weapons.

[Lebedev] Yes, Rudolf Georgiyevich, another thing here is that in fact the United States, as is now becoming more and more clear, has been preparing for this for the last 2 to 3 years, though of course in the last 2 to 3 years it has assumed the most scandalous forms, one might say. There are a great many sources which show that the roots of the development of these antisatellite defense systems, which subsequently became transformed into the "star wars" program, in fact go back to the fifties. As U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Burt admitted, the Pentagon has been spending \$250 million a year since as long ago as the mid seventies on developing this system. This is information that \$40 billion has already been spent over that period since the start of the fifties, so that of course there can be no waiting until the year 2000, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, to negotiate and conclude an agreement on the prevention of the arms race in space: it will be too late.

[Kolchanov] The historical approach, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, really is a very convincing one, and I mean the historical approach to the modern day. Perhaps we could return a little to the history of the question of banning nuclear tests, Aleksandr Vladimirovich?

#### Nuclear Test Ban

[Zholkver] Yes indeed, especially as these problems are very closely linked. Why does the United States so stubbornly oppose this, even though the Soviet Union has unilaterally ceased nuclear testing and has declared that if the United States were to join this, then it would be possible to extend this prohibition beyond January 1 of next year?

[Kolchanov] Would you like me to answer your question with someone else's words as to why the United States is opposed? Let me also touch on history a little. In 1983 the U.S. arms control agency explained with rare frankness to congressmen precisely why the U.S. leadership does not want an accord on ceasing nuclear tests. Nuclear testing, this explanation emphasized, is essential for the development, modernization, and classification of warheads; the preservation of reliable stocks, and the appraisal of the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. In this statement Washington publicly admitted for the first time that it finds experimental explosions essential in carrying out a program of modernization and replenishment of its nuclear arsenals, and in preparing for "star wars."

[Zholkver] It is that last point that I have in mind. You know, you look at this latest test conducted with laser weapons on the Titan missile standing on the ground. Here, you know, the laser also used nuclear components -- deuterium. Here it is very closely tied in. If all nuclear tests were to be halted, as has been done by the Soviet Union and as we propose that the United States also do, this would hinder

8 October 1985

the further improvement of nuclear weapons themselves, as you said Rudolf Georgiyevich. It would create a very serious barrier to the development of a whole series of "star wars" programs. It is no accident that attention is drawn to this by U.S. senators themselves. For example, an article was published in the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator Proxmire, one of the famous U.S. senators who calls the Soviet Union's decision to halt nuclear explosions serious and significant, and who says that the United States must join this, especially since it is bound to this by the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests in three spheres. In it, the point of the matter was that the nuclear powers would try to extend this to a complete prohibition on nuclear tests. By the way, Proxmire rejects all talk that this prohibition on tests is difficult to control. Nothing of the kind, he declares: Our, that is the U.S. seismological service, is now capable of recording any significant -- that is from the military point of view -- underground nuclear tests.

[Kolchanov] In 1961 there was the U.S. nuclear weapons testing program, Gnome, and these tests were immediately registered in many countries.

[Zholkver] And by the way, the latest U.S. tests in Nevada, as you know, were reported in our publications with reference...

[Kolchanov interrupting] They were registered in Sweden...

[Zholkver, interrupting] ...to the precise register.

[Kolchanov] The 20-kiloton blast was 30 meters underground in the Las Vegas area. To talk about the impossibility of control, well, its just ridiculous.

[Lebedev] No, the question of control is of course used -- and this has been clear for many, many years -- by the U.S. side and the West as a whole, as a ruse to evade the serious discussion and conclusion of really effective agreements.

It is appropriate to say here on the subject of space, of space weapons, you know, once again this same ruse is being used to block the talks, by saying that there were difficulties in control. It is also appropriate here to mention the opinion of a sufficiently knowledgeable figure -- retired Admiral Gayler, ex-commander in chief of the U.S. forces in the Pacific, who by the way was the director of the National Security Agency in the late sixties and early seventies. He quite firmly declares that the treaty prohibiting work on the creation of antisatellite weapons will easily be subject to verification; the same is applicable to nuclear weapons tests. It has been stated in an editorial in the U.S. publication THE NATION: This year the United States conducted far more tests than the Soviet Union, and over the course of many years it has surpassed the USSR on this score. But it also may be appropriate to say something on the question of the test moratorium, that the Western press has one kind of dishonest device: They are always leaving out the second part of our statement, and that is that this moratorium will not last only until January 1986, but will also apply even longer if the Americans follow this good example. The Western press obstinately does not write about this.

#### Chemical Weapons

[Zholkver] The question then naturally arises that if all these invented arguments about which we were talking fall away, what then are the very real, and probably very

influential forces that stimulate the United States to step up the arms race in all directions both on earth and in space? They can of course be named in one expression, in short, the U.S. military-industrial complex. There are of course many components. For example, the leader of the U.S. war department, Weinberger, has reportedly even put off his trip to Asian countries planned for next month in order to be in Washington during preparations for the summit-level meeting in Geneva, in order, as the U.S. television company CBS reported, not to allow the adherents of a compromise to gain the upper hand. Behind this there are quite concrete, I would say monetary interests. We were just speaking about space weapons: You mentioned sums in thousands of millions. So more concretely, the companies Boeing, General Dynamics, and Ford Aerospace, they just received only the very, very first orders -- \$53 million for the development of designs for space electromagnetic guns. The concerns of Lockheed, Grumman, and TRW have been allocated \$20 million each for just the development of the idea -- the idea for producing space weapons. This is the kind of scale, so to speak, in which military orders and profits are proceeding here. Well, this concerns another very fearful weapon of mass destruction as well, chemical weapons. You know, there recently was a news conference in Moscow on the question of a new stage in the U.S. chemical program, the production of so-called binary shells with a capacity to paralyze the nerves. On this score I also read some interesting data in THE NEW YORK TIMES in an article with this noteworthy headline: "Competition for Contracts To Produce Poison Gas Announced." It reports that the Pentagon is allocating \$2.5 billion on the production of binary shells, which American chemical companies hope to obtain in the thousands of millions. A leader of one of these companies, a comparatively small company, Crawford and Russell, declared the following, literally: We, as a company, do not involve ourselves in protest against the ethical side of this program.

[Kolchanov] Ah, yes. They are the ones trading in silent death as they call it now.

[Zholkver] Yes, they consider that money does not smell even if it smells of poison gas.

[Kolchanov] Well, here is another quite interesting report. The newspaper NEWSDAY refers to the Pentagon and says that the cake has already been cut up: A list of companies that will obtain orders for manufacturing this lethal weapon has been compiled.

By the way, a whole list of these firms was published. The majority of them are the same firms which you, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, already mentioned in connection with nuclear weapons. That is the military-industrial concerns -- the makers of this weaponry. The allocations are just as huge, running into millions and billions -- the profit they reckon to receive.

[Lebedev] In connection with chemical weapons, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, I would like to note two points: In the first place, chemical weapons have been left in the shade in a way in recent years, perhaps in connection with these sinister U.S. plans to achieve superiority in the nuclear and space spheres. But this does not make chemical weapons any less dangerous, and their use has not become any the less frightening in the Pentagon's plans.

Back in September 1981 one of the leaders of the U.S. war department, a man called Wade, stated in Congress that the speedy provision of the latest types of chemical

weaponry for the U.S. Army was essential, in order to have the opportunity of waging large-scale chemical warfare in Europe against the Warsaw Pact countries. That is, plans are being worked out for a first strike including chemical weapons. And, despite the fact that even as things are, Western Europe has been turned into not only the nuclear powder keg that it already is, but...

[Kolchanov interrupts] Now it is a chemical hostage -- that expression exists.

[Lebedev] Yes, not just a nuclear hostage, but also a chemical hostage, and with the implementation of this program for binary aerial bombs and artillery shells the arsenals of chemical weapons in Europe will grow on a gigantic scale. And they are intended for deployment above all in West Germany, Britain, Italy, and Turkey -- just at a time when a discussion is going on at the Geneva disarmament conference of a draft treaty to prohibit and destroy all types of chemical weaponry. What is more, this is being done despite the attitude in many countries and continents; the Indian press, for example, has had a lively discussion of this issue and writes that this is a threat not just to Europe but also to other regions. Finally, this is being done on the eve of the meeting in Geneva of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Kolchanov] And they are not even satisfied with the 1983-1987 5-year program for chemical rearmament, on which \$10 billion is being spent -- it is not just that this program is being made concrete, but also being developed. It is planned -- after the large-scale equipping of the U.S. Army with new binary weapons has been carried out -- to increase the number of units from 3 million at present to over 5 million. This figure includes bombs, shells, and so on -- a huge increase, almost double.

[Zholkver] I should point out that this is causing serious anxiety. The latest issue of the magazine NATO REPORT says bluntly that the threat of the appearance of binary shells on the continent has caused a feeling of concern and acute controversy in many NATO countries, above all in West Germany, about which you were speaking, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich. There are already major stockpiles of chemical arms there, and now we have had statements from both the Social Democrats and trade unionists saying that no more consignments of chemical shells and bombs should be allowed to be deployed there. The chairman of the land trade union organization in Rhineland-Palatinate -- where these stockpiles of chemical arms are chiefly deployed -- declared frankly that U.S. interests here do not coincide with the interests of the FRG, and that the West German Government should make an unambiguous choice between the vital interests of our people and vassal-like loyalty to Washington.

It must be said that real opportunities of avoiding this danger do exist. The Governments of the GDR and Czechoslovakia have put forward a proposal for the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe. This proposal was addressed to Chancellor Kohl for discussion. It is known that the SPD in West Germany supports it, and the Soviet Union regards the initiative positively -- so there are opportunities of averting this danger, especially in this dangerous area of the world.

[Lebedev] Yes, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, I should like continue your train of thought a little. To avoid presenting a one-sided picture that there is no strong opposition within these countries to all these plans -- on chemical weapons, on "star wars," on the nuclear arms buildup -- it must be said for the sake of fairness that in the U.S. Congress, for example, there are no few opponents of these plans. Incidentally, the U.S. press reported recently that something like 40 U.S. universities have already protested about the anti-satellite program.



[Kolchanov] A book by 300 scientists, "The Truth and Lies About Star Wars," has just been published.

#### Reagan-Gorbachev Summit

[Lebedev] Yes, Nobel prizewinners. Incidentally, we're coming up to United Nations Foundation Day, and on that day a week of public action starts in all the countries of the world against the arms race and for disarmament. It is clear that the public will raise its voice against all these sinister plans. I have already mentioned that the -- from a political point of view -- very important meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and the U.S. President in Geneva is drawing near. The peoples of the world have high hopes for this meeting, and for our part we are showing good will and a constructive attitude. And this is felt everywhere, including in the United States. Reagan was asked a very interesting question at a recent press conference in Washington. Mr President, one journalist asked, why is the United States constantly trying to dampen hopes placed on the outcome of the summit meeting you are to have in November with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev? The President hesitated and just mumbled something totally incomprehensible.

#### Space, Nuclear Weapons Talks

[Zholkver] Well, similar questions are being asked in connection with that other Soviet-U.S. meeting taking place in Geneva even now -- I have in mind the third round of Soviet-US. talks on space and nuclear weapons which started this week. I saw an interesting statement made by members of the U.S. delegation itself in Geneva -- they were talking to correspondents of THE NEW YORK TIMES -- in which they fairly frankly expressed their alarm, as they put it, over the propaganda success which the Soviet Union has scored in recent months, to the detriment of the Americans. They were talking about the fact that after the 2-month summer break between rounds the balance is indeed not weighted in favor of the United States. During those 2 months the Soviet Union halted nuclear explosions and unilaterally halted the deployment of medium-range missiles. What was the United States up to during those 2 months? We have already had a good deal to say about that here. And of course, it is not a question of propaganda. You were quite right in what you said Rudolf Georgiyevich. It would be no bad thing, by the way, if the United States took up that kind of propaganda, if one may call it that.

[Kolchanov] Yes, if this is propaganda, go ahead and make propaganda -- let's have your constructive proposals.

[Lebedev] Yes, what, for example, is stopping the United States, when the Soviet Union, during the previous round of the Geneva talks, declared a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and on other countermeasures adopted in connection with the start of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles?

Why, one wonders, could not the United States act in the same way, and halt at least the deployment of its missiles? But no, they reject all that. Also at the previous round in Geneva the Soviet Union proposed that a total moratorium on all nuclear and space arms be declared for the entire period of the talks. Again the United States replied no.

#### U.S. 'Bluff'

[Kolchanov] In connection with the discussion of the subject of the arms race -- the ASAT system and binary chemical weapons -- I would like to make one remark. It

seems to me that in all these U.S. actions there is a fair share of bluff -- an attempt to put pressure on us. I cannot help recalling the story of the atom bomb in 1945. In that barbaric act, too, there was an attempt to threaten us, an attempt to bring us to our knees. I see something similar in the present actions of the Americans, about which I was talking. But they should remember that just as we grasped the true situation then, so we shall today, even more so. We have the means to stand up for ourselves, and we shall certainly do that. And to bluff in the international arena, in relations between the great powers, is clearly an unworthy device. In the nuclear age, a new way of thinking is needed.

[Zholkver] Yes, to conclude our conversation, I should like to remind you that, for example, during his meeting with the Japan Socialist Party delegation, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted that it is now exceptionally important to mobilize the world public against the threat of nuclear war, and that the CPSU regards as the most important goal, corresponding to the hopes of all peoples, the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons and the total deliverance of mankind from the threat of nuclear war. On that note we end our conversation at the roundtable. Thank you, comrades, for taking part in it. Thank you, comrade listeners, for your attention.

CSO: 5200/1003

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

**16 OCT. 85**  
cush